In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]” Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: 1. The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. 2. WHAT IS THE BASIS FOR THIS RULE? WHY WOULD IDNR ALLOW THE POSTPONEMENT OF CHEMICAL DISCLOSURE, WHEN THE CHEMICALS USED IN HYRDROFRACKING ARE SO DANGEROUS AND HAZARDOUS TO HUMAN HEALTH? Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: 1. INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. 2. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section: First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section:First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]”Why these are problems:The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous.Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit.Needed changes:INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions.Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section:First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]”Why these are problems:The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous.Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit.Needed changes:INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions.Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Problems with this section:First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part “must submit” certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it “documents to the Department’s satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]”Why these are problems:The criteria for documenting “to the Department’s satisfaction” are subjective, vague, and ambiguous.Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit.Needed changes:INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions.Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, SANDRA NICKERSON WEST DUNDEE, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.210 Permit Application Requirements Problems with this section: * First and foremost, Section 245.210 states that every applicant for a permit under this Part "must submit" certain information, including a Chemical Disclosure Report identifying each chemical and proppant anticipated to be used in hydraulic fracturing fluid for each state of the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations. * However, Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time the application is submitted […]" Why these are problems: * The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous. * Fracking operators should not be able to unilaterally determine postponement of chemical disclosure report under any circumstances. Obviously, if the operator is aware of the chemical they are using there should be no allowance for delay in disclosure to IDNR. If they do not know what chemicals they are using, that should be an automatic acknowledgment they are not capable of safe operation and not be granted a permit. Needed changes: * INDR must require prior disclosure of all chemicals used in the operation with no exceptions. * Non-disclosure in any fashion upon filing the required Chemical Disclosure Report must be determined by the Department as grounds for not approving, or revocation of the permit.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Residents of cities, villages and incorprated areas can voice their opinions in regard to fracking. How will those in rural areas make their wishes known?

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: If fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, M Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: If fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, M Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). I would like to see the following changes: -The rules must require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. The local government should have authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. -The rules must establish a process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. -The rules must set minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why I'm advocating for these changes: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must be empowered to review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations should cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Amanda Woodall 4949 N. Whipple Street Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). I would like to see the following changes: -The rules must require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. The local government should have authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. -The rules must establish a process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. -The rules must set minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why I'm advocating for these changes: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must be empowered to review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations should cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Amanda Woodall 4949 N. Whipple Street Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts.Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified:In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought.A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified:Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand.The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times.Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Janet Elizabeth Donoghue 5082 Springer Ridge Rd Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 69187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 69187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nancy Eichelberger 8405 S Ridge Rd Plainfield, IL 60544

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: 1.While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. 2.There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. 3.There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: 1.The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: 1.In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. 2.Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. 2.A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: 1.Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. 2.By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. 3.The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: 1.Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. 2.If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. 3.IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standard

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Tim brooks Chicago, IL 60652

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: "If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:" (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator's water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced "D4 drought – exceptional", the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as "at risk public water supply" are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator's water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires permit applicants to submit: a Water Source Management plan: “If fresh water is anticipated to be used in the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing treatment, a water source management plan that shall include the following information:” (source of ground or surface water, how much water to be used, months of use, methods to minimize fresh water use, methods used to minimize adverse impact to aquatic life). Problems with this section: While there is a required water management plan, this plan does not require application to local municipal, water district or other governmental control units requesting use of their ground or surface water resources. In fact, if fracking is allowed, local government has no authority to deny water to a frack well operator, even in the case of drought. There is no process for sharing the frack operator’s water plan with other state or regional agencies responsible for water usage (e.g. Illinois EPA, East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee) for their input on whether the plan is adequate, and how usage relates to possible drought situations. There are no minimum regulatory thresholds regarding the amount of water to be used, the impact of water use given drought situations, actual impact on aquatic life, impact on existing human, industrial and agricultural water immediate needs, and potential future impacts. Why these are problems: The IDNR report The Drought of 2012, March 2013 identified: In 2012, the 12 counties of southern IL--where the majority of fracking leases have been obtained--experienced “D4 drought – exceptional”, the most severe drought rating. From July to December 2012 the area was in continuous drought. Two of three local areas identified as “at risk public water supply” are in potential frack operation counties (Macon, Johnson, IL). These counties were identified in an IL EPA 2012 drought report as having Community Water Systems most stressed by the drought. A report by the East Central IL Regional Water Supply Planning Committee identified: Springfield has a greater than 50% probability their water system will be unable to meet projected water use with a drought of record. By 2020, Bloomington and Decatur's water systems will be inadequate to meet demand. The average water use by a frack operator is significant and will have an impact on water usage. According to federal EPA, the average frack uses 4.4 million gallons of water. And wells can be fracked multiple times. Needed changes: Any governmental unit that involves itself in local or regional water issues must review the frack operator water source management plan with the power to affirm, reject or modify the plan. If a county or geographic area is identified as being in a drought, frack operations will cease. IDNR must develop scientifically based high minimum, specific standards of water usage protecting existing human, agricultural and industrial use. A frack operator’s water source management plan must adhere to these formal standards.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210 requires that when "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." But the vast majority of fracking in Illinois is going to occur outside of municipalities; it will occur in areas where the local government unit is the county. The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Decatur, Carbondale, Marion, or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If permission is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? Solution: As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making and give counties and other local governmental decision-makers a say in whether fracking will be allowed in their communities and, if allowed, exactly how it will occur.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Section 245.210(a)(8) allows an applicant to postpone submission of a Chemical Disclosure Report if it "documents to the Department's satisfaction why the information is not available at the time The criteria for documenting "to the Department's satisfaction" are subjective, vague, and ambiguous.he application is submitted […]"

Sincerely, Oscar Ramirez 4414 N Christiana Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Simply put this bill was put through by land owners who wanted to profit from fracking which I find to be a conflict of interest! I feel the counties have a right to be safe and excluding their rights is wrong. We need to keep these things away from schools...the kids deserve our protection. There are five counties that do not want fracking and yet they are being forced into this. The Governor has failed to protect the counties ...the Department of Health is not involved the sick must hire an attorney to find out from the States Attorney what trade chemical is injuring them...the whole process is corrupt! There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the resident themselves. AS the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties....and when the Northern counties realize the threat of earth quake this will cause and nuke power plant collapses or cracks they will want this to change too.

Sincerely, JoAnn Conrad 13 Red Oak Lane Springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Simply put this bill was put through by land owners who wanted to profit from fracking which I find to be a conflict of interest! I feel the counties have a right to be safe and excluding their rights is wrong. We need to keep these things away from schools...the kids deserve our protection. There are five counties that do not want fracking and yet they are being forced into this. The Governor has failed to protect the counties ...the Department of Health is not involved the sick must hire an attorney to find out from the States Attorney what trade chemical is injuring them...the whole process is corrupt! There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the resident themselves. AS the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties....and when the Northern counties realize the threat of earth quake this will cause and nuke power plant collapses or cracks they will want this to change too.

Sincerely, JoAnn Conrad 13 Red Oak Lane Springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

There is no completely safe way for the IDNR nor any Illinois govt. agency to assure the safe practice of an inherently unsafe procedure as fracking. I nor any family member or friend i know in this state want fracking in Illinois, nor sand mining, meaning the permanent degradation of land that could be used for farming and food, tourism, native land restoration and other uses. We only have one earth, and a few jobs at what cost? Future generations succumbing to illness and death on dead land, poisoned land and water? The state needs to come up with better solutions for jobs and economy that do not poison our resources. The future is renewable resources and restoration of the land. The IDNR should be charged with protecting our resources, not allowing its destruction.

Sincerely, Tracy Kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

This section specifies that an application for a fracking well site must have official consent from municipal authorities of a city, village, or incorporated town. However, In much of Southeastern Illinois, where fracking is anticipated to take place, the residents live in unincorporated areas where the county is the most direct level of government. This provision needs revision to include county governments including those overseeing unincorporated residential areas, so that local residents will have some government supervision over fracking operations in their communities.

Sincerely, Ivy Czekanski 601 W. Deming Place #502 Chicago, IL 60614

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

To the Illinois Department of Resources, After taking time to look over the proposed rules and regulations for hydraulic fracturing in Illinois I find the rules to be inadequate and quite frankly I find them to be a joke. To start things off, the Rules state "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". While in high school, and especially now as a college student pursuing a higher education, I write plenty of papers and I find this lack of studies and sources of underlying data to be quite distasteful. It is near finals week for me and I have several research papers that I am currently writing. These papers are a mere 8-10 pages each (versus the 135 page document for proposed rules composed by your department) and for each paper I have to use at least 6-8 sources. This is a paper we are talking about and though it is important to my learning and education to be writing it, it is not something as serious as hydraulic fracturing. I seriously question your department's competence, or lack thereof, with regards to this. If you are not going to consult science and cold hard facts (unbiased in the least) while drafting the rules, then hydraulic fracturing should not even be a question in Illinois: It should simply not be allowed because we are not adequately preparing for it or examining it. Though I understand that what you have proposed is just a draft, even drafts should have sources and consult the science behind this environmentally harmful and stressful process. The papers I mentioned that I am currently writing for a few finals require several steps. First, I have to choose a topic (this is easy for you since the topic of hydraulic fracturing has "been assigned" to you). Next, I have to brainstorm how I am going to go about writing my paper including: what points I want to convey, what side I am taking (if it is an argumentative paper), how I am going to convey the points I am making, etcetera. Then there is the outline: I have to structure my paper in an outline format, consider what sources I am going to use, and transition my paper between sections to allow a flow easy for the reader to follow. The first draft comes next. This is basically my whole paper, with perhaps a few improvements to be made along the way. Ultimately, it follows the format of my proposed outline and it includes all the sources I have collected and found appropriate to be implemented into my paper. Several drafts may occur until, finally, I find my paper to be adequate enough to be turned in and graded! Again, I understand that these proposed rules are just a draft, but it seems to me that it is a very insufficient first draft especially because it does not include "sources of underlying data, resources, etc". How can you hope to construct a document such as this without such sources? Everything you have proposed should be thrown out because it has not consulted studies. This is of course the main point I am making. However, the only reason that I can assume your rules and regulations are so ill prepared is that you must have preferred to get assigned the other side of this topic. You are proposing rules and regulations so that hydraulic fracturing can start taking place in Illinois, but perhaps it would have been easier for you to write about why it should not be coming to Illinois, I am sure you would have found plenty of sources on that! As for my demands: I demand that you continue making this inadequate document into an actual first draft, rather than procrastinate it and write it all in one night (is that why you could not collect sources, not enough time?). I also demand that you start representing the people

in this matter. There is obviously a lot of controversy with hydraulic fracturing coming to Illinois, aren't you asking yourselves why? Take a trip down to Southern Illinois, perhaps for a few days, and go without drinking water that whole time (to show how your groundwater could be contaminated from the process), imagine all of your belongings and your whole home crumbling before you as you experience the fourth earthquake of a 4.9 magnitude (and now the fracking site can be shut down for inducing those earthquakes…about an earthquake too late), and punch yourself in your nose (some of the associated health impacts to fracking include bloody noses, just ask those who have been affected) just for starters. This may seem like an unreasonable request…for me to be asking you to do such things, but I feel that until you personally experience the different effects of fracking you will only continue to cater and be under the grasp of big corporations and continue to make loopholes in the rules and regulations for those corporations, as has already been seen in what you have proposed. Thank you for your time and for reading this, and please PLEASE consider what I have put before you.

Sincerely, Anica Washington 7308 S Champlain Ave Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

To the Illinois Department of Resources, After taking time to look over the proposed rules and regulations for hydraulic fracturing in Illinois I find the rules to be inadequate and quite frankly I find them to be a joke. To start things off, the Rules state "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". While in high school, and especially now as a college student pursuing a higher education, I write plenty of papers and I find this lack of studies and sources of underlying data to be quite distasteful. It is near finals week for me and I have several research papers that I am currently writing. These papers are a mere 8-10 pages each (versus the 135 page document for proposed rules composed by your department) and for each paper I have to use at least 6-8 sources. This is a paper we are talking about and though it is important to my learning and education to be writing it, it is not something as serious as hydraulic fracturing. I seriously question your department's competence, or lack thereof, with regards to this. If you are not going to consult science and cold hard facts (unbiased in the least) while drafting the rules, then hydraulic fracturing should not even be a question in Illinois: It should simply not be allowed because we are not adequately preparing for it or examining it. Though I understand that what you have proposed is just a draft, even drafts should have sources and consult the science behind this environmentally harmful and stressful process. The papers I mentioned that I am currently writing for a few finals require several steps. First, I have to choose a topic (this is easy for you since the topic of hydraulic fracturing has "been assigned" to you). Next, I have to brainstorm how I am going to go about writing my paper including: what points I want to convey, what side I am taking (if it is an argumentative paper), how I am going to convey the points I am making, etcetera. Then there is the outline: I have to structure my paper in an outline format, consider what sources I am going to use, and transition my paper between sections to allow a flow easy for the reader to follow. The first draft comes next. This is basically my whole paper, with perhaps a few improvements to be made along the way. Ultimately, it follows the format of my proposed outline and it includes all the sources I have collected and found appropriate to be implemented into my paper. Several drafts may occur until, finally, I find my paper to be adequate enough to be turned in and graded! Again, I understand that these proposed rules are just a draft, but it seems to me that it is a very insufficient first draft especially because it does not include "sources of underlying data, resources, etc". How can you hope to construct a document such as this without such sources? Everything you have proposed should be thrown out because it has not consulted studies. This is of course the main point I am making. However, the only reason that I can assume your rules and regulations are so ill prepared is that you must have preferred to get assigned the other side of this topic. You are proposing rules and regulations so that hydraulic fracturing can start taking place in Illinois, but perhaps it would have been easier for you to write about why it should not be coming to Illinois, I am sure you would have found plenty of sources on that! As for my demands: I demand that you continue making this inadequate document into an actual first draft, rather than procrastinate it and write it all in one night (is that why you could not collect sources, not enough time?). I also demand that you start representing the people

in this matter. There is obviously a lot of controversy with hydraulic fracturing coming to Illinois, aren't you asking yourselves why? Take a trip down to Southern Illinois, perhaps for a few days, and go without drinking water that whole time (to show how your groundwater could be contaminated from the process), imagine all of your belongings and your whole home crumbling before you as you experience the fourth earthquake of a 4.9 magnitude (and now the fracking site can be shut down for inducing those earthquakes…about an earthquake too late), and punch yourself in your nose (some of the associated health impacts to fracking include bloody noses, just ask those who have been affected) just for starters. This may seem like an unreasonable request…for me to be asking you to do such things, but I feel that until you personally experience the different effects of fracking you will only continue to cater and be under the grasp of big corporations and continue to make loopholes in the rules and regulations for those corporations, as has already been seen in what you have proposed. Thank you for your time and for reading this, and please PLEASE consider what I have put before you.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna 425 S Wabash (1406B) Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

To the Illinois Department of Resources, After taking time to look over the proposed rules and regulations for hydraulic fracturing in Illinois I find the rules to be inadequate and quite frankly I find them to be a joke. To start things off, the Rules state "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". While in high school, and especially now as a college student pursuing a higher education, I write plenty of papers and I find this lack of studies and sources of underlying data to be quite distasteful. It is near finals week for me and I have several research papers that I am currently writing. These papers are a mere 8-10 pages each (versus the 135 page document for proposed rules composed by your department) and for each paper I have to use at least 6-8 sources. This is a paper we are talking about and though it is important to my learning and education to be writing it, it is not something as serious as hydraulic fracturing. I seriously question your department's competence, or lack thereof, with regards to this. If you are not going to consult science and cold hard facts (unbiased in the least) while drafting the rules, then hydraulic fracturing should not even be a question in Illinois: It should simply not be allowed because we are not adequately preparing for it or examining it. Though I understand that what you have proposed is just a draft, even drafts should have sources and consult the science behind this environmentally harmful and stressful process. The papers I mentioned that I am currently writing for a few finals require several steps. First, I have to choose a topic (this is easy for you since the topic of hydraulic fracturing has "been assigned" to you). Next, I have to brainstorm how I am going to go about writing my paper including: what points I want to convey, what side I am taking (if it is an argumentative paper), how I am going to convey the points I am making, etcetera. Then there is the outline: I have to structure my paper in an outline format, consider what sources I am going to use, and transition my paper between sections to allow a flow easy for the reader to follow. The first draft comes next. This is basically my whole paper, with perhaps a few improvements to be made along the way. Ultimately, it follows the format of my proposed outline and it includes all the sources I have collected and found appropriate to be implemented into my paper. Several drafts may occur until, finally, I find my paper to be adequate enough to be turned in and graded! Again, I understand that these proposed rules are just a draft, but it seems to me that it is a very insufficient first draft especially because it does not include "sources of underlying data, resources, etc". How can you hope to construct a document such as this without such sources? Everything you have proposed should be thrown out because it has not consulted studies. This is of course the main point I am making. However, the only reason that I can assume your rules and regulations are so ill prepared is that you must have preferred to get assigned the other side of this topic. You are proposing rules and regulations so that hydraulic fracturing can start taking place in Illinois, but perhaps it would have been easier for you to write about why it should not be coming to Illinois, I am sure you would have found plenty of sources on that! As for my demands: I demand that you continue making this inadequate document into an actual first draft, rather than procrastinate it and write it all in one night (is that why you could not collect sources, not enough time?). I also demand that you start representing the people

in this matter. There is obviously a lot of controversy with hydraulic fracturing coming to Illinois, aren't you asking yourselves why? Take a trip down to Southern Illinois, perhaps for a few days, and go without drinking water that whole time (to show how your groundwater could be contaminated from the process), imagine all of your belongings and your whole home crumbling before you as you experience the fourth earthquake of a 4.9 magnitude (and now the fracking site can be shut down for inducing those earthquakes…about an earthquake too late), and punch yourself in your nose (some of the associated health impacts to fracking include bloody noses, just ask those who have been affected) just for starters. This may seem like an unreasonable request…for me to be asking you to do such things, but I feel that until you personally experience the different effects of fracking you will only continue to cater and be under the grasp of big corporations and continue to make loopholes in the rules and regulations for those corporations, as has already been seen in what you have proposed. Thank you for your time and for reading this, and please PLEASE consider what I have put before you.

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Bayee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Bayee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Betty Bland Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Betty Bland Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Betty Bland Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application.

Sincerely, Janelle Redfield Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. It is imperative that the oversight and permission rights for fracking be available to county residents and governments, not only to municipalities.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. It is imperative that the oversight and permission rights for fracking be available to county residents and governments, not only to municipalities.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. THIS COMMENT REFLECTS THE FACT THAT REGULATIONS WERE DRAFTED WITHOUT REPRESENTATION FROM THOSE WHO WILL BE MOST AFFECTED. THIS SECTION DEMONSTRATES BLATANT DISREGARD FOR THE REALITIES OF THE GEOGRAPHY OF FRACKING IN ILLINOIS REGARDING CITIES COMPARED TO COUNTIES. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? In addition, this body should note that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court just struck down as unconstitutional the rule (in Pa.) which gives states the authority to preempt counties from regulating fracking within their jurisdiction. The Illinois Appellate Court in the Fifth District has set a similar precedent for local control over basic zoning in the City of Carlyle case. The regulations must recognize the common sense principles that Counties and unincorporated towns should have some ability to regulate such things as setbacks from churches, schools, daycare, elder care, homes, water supplies, and public parks.

Sincerely, Richard Fedder Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties? In addition, this body should note that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court just struck down as unconstitutional the rule (in Pa.) which gives states the authority to preempt counties from regulating fracking within their jurisdiction. The Illinois Appellate Court in the Fifth District has set a similar precedent for local control over basic zoning in the City of Carlyle case. The regulations must recognize the common sense principles that Counties and unincorporated towns should have some ability to regulate such things as setbacks from churches, schools, daycare, elder care, homes, water supplies, and public parks.

Sincerely, Richard Fedder Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application. This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, tim brooks Chicago, IL 60652

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Who is in control .245.210 Permit Application Requirements "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? •The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. •This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. •Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. •There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves.

Sincerely, M. Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Who is in control .245.210 Permit Application Requirements "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." This is excellent for municipalities, but what about counties? •The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. •This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. •Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. •There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves.

Sincerely, M. Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why are there no rules that require counties to provide consent for fracking permits when the county is the smallest level of government in an area for potential fracking operations? The following clause allows only for for municipal rule: "When an application is made to frack a well site located within the limits of any city, village or incorporated town, the application shall state the name of the city, village, or incorporated town and be accompanied with a certified copy of the official consent for the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations to occur from the municipal authorities where the well site is proposed to be located. No permit shall be issued unless consent is secured and filed with the permit application." The intent of the legislation was to recognize that local units of government should have decision-making power regarding whether to allow fracking in their jurisdictions. This section demonstrates blatant disregard for the realities of the geography of fracking in Illinois regarding cities compared to counties. Little if any fracking is anticipated within the cities of Carbondale, Marion, Decatur or other metro areas affected by the majority of fracking land leases. If prior notification and an intentional process of permitting is important for metropolitan communities, why are the proposed rules silent regarding neighborhoods in counties and the families living there? There is no substantive difference between a municipal or county government in Illinois in its powers other than the issue of Illinois Constitutional Home Rule. However, the lack of county Home Rule has never preempted a county power to issue permits on mineral or oil extraction. Numerous county governments have long histories and traditions in the permitting process regarding mineral and drilling industries. As the current fracking law is largely silent on the issue of county control, IDNR rules should err on the side of history and citizen decision-making. Counties and municipalities of government tax, employ law enforcement, provide social services and infrastructure. The rules provide no explanation why citizens residing in counties of Illinois should have less input regarding fracking permits. The regulatory differentiation between the rights of residents in municipalities vs. counties creates a group of second class citizens. These second class citizens have fewer rights in their ability to participate and ultimately determine the type and quality of energy extraction allowed in their neighborhoods. There is no reasonable expectation that the personnel at IDNR have any better or more clear understanding of the will of citizens in counties regarding fracking permits than the residents themselves. As the proposed IDNR rules envision municipalities empowered to decide fracking sites, what possible argument does IDNR have that it is better equipped or knowledgeable on the needs of residents living in Illinois counties?

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why would the operators NOT disclose ALL CHEMICALS THEY ARE USING??? They eithr do not know what they are using or they are hiding something. Either reason is frightening!! Any other reason to fail to disclose??

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler 2 Pioneer Lane Red Bud , IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why would the operators NOT disclose ALL CHEMICALS THEY ARE USING??? They eithr do not know what they are using or they are hiding something. Either reason is frightening!! Any other reason to fail to disclose??

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler 2 Pioneer Lane Red Bud , IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why would the operators NOT disclose ALL CHEMICALS THEY ARE USING??? They eithr do not know what they are using or they are hiding something. Either reason is frightening!! Any other reason to fail to disclose??

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler 2 Pioneer Lane Red Bud , IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.210 Permit Application Requirements

Why would the operators NOT disclose ALL CHEMICALS THEY ARE USING??? They eithr do not know what they are using or they are hiding something. Either reason is frightening!! Any other reason to fail to disclose??

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler 2 Pioneer Lane Red Bud , IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

I got an invite for an event on Facebook to go to this website to give my thoughts on fracking. By the looks of the site, they're hoping I'll write an angry comment against fracking, however I fully support the process. Bring on the jobs and use US natural resources.
http://www.protectilfromfracking.org/inadequate-bonding-requirements-frackingcompanies# main Facebook event: Send a Comment for Fracking.

Sincerely, Shelby Ray Bloomington, IL 61704

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

I got an invite for an event on Facebook to go to this website to give my thoughts on fracking. By the looks of the site, they're hoping I'll write an angry comment against fracking, however I fully support the process. Bring on the jobs and use US natural resources.
http://www.protectilfromfracking.org/inadequate-bonding-requirements-frackingcompanies# main Facebook event: Send a Comment for Fracking.

Sincerely, Shelby Ray Bloomington, IL 61704

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

I got an invite for an event on Facebook to go to this website to give my thoughts on fracking. By the looks of the site, they're hoping I'll write an angry comment against fracking, however I fully support the process. Bring on the jobs and use US natural resources.
http://www.protectilfromfracking.org/inadequate-bonding-requirements-frackingcompanies# main Facebook event: Send a Comment for Fracking.

Sincerely, Shelby Ray Bloomington, IL 61704

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

I, too would raise questions about the cost of plugging wells. Would the ooperator be willing to pay this or would such operator forfeit the bond? Then who is left to pay? The county?

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

No I don't want it. You will ruin our most precious resource, Water. Please think of our children and the path we leave for them after were gone.

Sincerely, Peter Julian 508 S. Logan Ave. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Please oh please oh please do not bring 'fracking' to Illinois. I want our state to stay clean and beautiful. I do not want my water ruined or my air polluted. I do not want earthquakes. I want clean water, clean air, clean soil, preserved land. Please DO NOT bring fracking to Illinois.

Sincerely, Molly Ann Nord Bloomington, IL 61701

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Please oh please oh please do not bring 'fracking' to Illinois. I want our state to stay clean and beautiful. I do not want my water ruined or my air polluted. I do not want earthquakes. I want clean water, clean air, clean soil, preserved land. Please DO NOT bring fracking to Illinois.

Sincerely, Molly Ann Nord Bloomington, IL 61701

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 should be revised to raise bonding requirements to levels that sufficiently protect the public against potential damages in the event of an accident or operator default. Each well site should be independently bonded.

Sincerely, Lan R. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Avenue Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, "The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits." (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, " The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. " (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study "Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk", PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, " The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. " (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study "Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk", PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) I read a study called “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, written by the PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center which reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. If I were a fracking company owner, I would prefer to simply pay the bond rather than do the right thing and plug the well for 700,000. I would take the extra 650,000 dollars that I made from ruining the environment to buy more ferraris.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jan A Pietrzak 12031 S 72nd Ct Palos Heights, IL 60463

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jan A Pietrzak 12031 S 72nd Ct Palos Heights, IL 60463

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Matthew Pava 401 Krebs Dr Champaign, IL 61822

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Mike Reed Box 421 Sheridan, IL 60551

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study. Illinois cannot afford to clean up after the industries that are destroying our lands and poisoning our children- shameful!

Sincerely, Miranda Bailey 1822 Park Ave Alton, IL 62002

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

Section 245.220 states, The bond shall be in the amount of $50,000 per permit or a blanket bond of $500,000 for all permits. (Section 1-65(a) of the Act) Plugging a well alone costs more than $50,000. In the study “Who Pays the Cost of Fracking?: Weak Bonding Rules for Oil and Gas Drilling Leave the Public At Risk”, PennEnvironment Research & Policy Center reported documented instances in which fracking wells have cost $700,000 or more to plug. What is the motivation for the operator to not simply forfeit the bond when they shut down? Furthermore, drilling companies typically frack a string of wells and not just one. If they are cutting corners, using improper well-casings for example, or not sealing them correctly, the violation is likely to occur at each site. One $500,000 bond for perhaps as many as 100 - 150 well sites is as unacceptable as a $50,000 for one well site. If the purpose of the bond is to protect the state from expenses incurred from an accident or violation, then the bond must be sufficient to cover those occurrences. It makes no sense to offer a blanket bond—like some bargain basement "buy 2 pairs of socks and get a third pair free". Each well should be bonded individually and in the amount necessary to cover real and imagined damages as outlined by the PennEnvironment study.

Sincerely, tim brooks Chicago, IL 60652

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

This section sounds like an attempt to appease environmentalists, not a realistic assessment of restitution for the damages that fracking has been known to cause at other sites. It needs to be rewritten to cover all of the damages that are likely to occur. If no damages occur, nothing has been lost. If damages to a well occur, the owners have a right to be reimbursed fully.

Sincerely, Clare Boehmer Reb Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.220 Permit Bonds or Other Collateral Securities

This section sounds like an attempt to appease environmentalists, not a realistic assessment of restitution for the damages that fracking has been known to cause at other sites. It needs to be rewritten to cover all of the damages that are likely to occur. If no damages occur, nothing has been lost. If damages to a well occur, the owners have a right to be reimbursed fully.

Sincerely, Clare Boehmer Reb Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

After taking time to look over the proposed rules and regulations for hydraulic fracturing in Illinois I find the rules to be inadequate and quite frankly I find them to be a joke. To start things off, the Rules state "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". While in high school, and especially now as a college student pursuing a higher education, I write plenty of papers and I find this lack of studies and sources of underlying data to be quite distasteful. It is near finals week for me and I have several research papers that I am currently writing. These papers are a mere 8-10 pages each (versus the 135 page document for proposed rules composed by your department) and for each paper I have to use at least 6-8 sources. This is a paper we are talking about and though it is important to my learning and education to be writing it, it is not something as serious as hydraulic fracturing. I seriously question your department's competence, or lack thereof, with regards to this. If you are not going to consult science and cold hard facts (unbiased in the least) while drafting the rules, then hydraulic fracturing should not even be a question in Illinois: It should simply not be allowed because we are not adequately preparing for it or examining it.

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

After taking time to look over the proposed rules and regulations for hydraulic fracturing in Illinois I find the rules to be inadequate and quite frankly I find them to be a joke. To start things off, the Rules state "Published studies or reports, and sources of underlying data, used to compose this rulemaking: None". While in high school, and especially now as a college student pursuing a higher education, I write plenty of papers and I find this lack of studies and sources of underlying data to be quite distasteful. It is near finals week for me and I have several research papers that I am currently writing. These papers are a mere 8-10 pages each (versus the 135 page document for proposed rules composed by your department) and for each paper I have to use at least 6-8 sources. This is a paper we are talking about and though it is important to my learning and education to be writing it, it is not something as serious as hydraulic fracturing. I seriously question your department's competence, or lack thereof, with regards to this. If you are not going to consult science and cold hard facts (unbiased in the least) while drafting the rules, then hydraulic fracturing should not even be a question in Illinois: It should simply not be allowed because we are not adequately preparing for it or examining it.

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Comment Submission for H.V.H.Fracking Draft Rules, My comment pertains to Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules which gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. The problem with this is that it doesn't stop the 60-day time-period from continuing. This situation could be a problem because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby denying the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Here are some possible revisions that could help this situation.This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Lucia Amorelli

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

IDNR's rules set up the system by which hydraulic fracturing permit applications are approved. Under Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the rules, IDNR has 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit application. The General Assembly's Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory act requires in Section 1-35 (f) that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” However, under IDNR's rules, if IDNR finds the application to be incomplete, it must provide written notification to the applicant and allow the applicant to correct them. However, the rules do not require that the 60-day review period recommence with the revision and resubmission of the permit application. If only graduate students had it so good. Hey, advisor! I realize that the first draft of my master's thesis was terrible, but here is the new version the day it's due five minutes before the end of the day. This would never fly in graduate school; I'm not sure why fracturing operators should have it so easy--especially when people's lives and health are at risk. The 60-day period is not just a time for IDNR to review the application, it is also the time that the public has been provided to prepare for the hearing. If a fracturing operator submits an incomplete application and then submits revisions at the end of the 60-day period, there will be no opportunity for the public to prepare for a hearing, let alone discuss or comment on the implications of the potential operation. IDNR's 60-day review period should not begin until the application is deemed complete by the department. Applicants with incomplete applications should be required to waive the 60-day requirement until such date as the application is complete. If the applicant refuses to do so, then IDNR should automatically reject the application and deny the permit. In addition, the public comment period should only begin once a complete permit application is submitted.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

North America doesn't have their own supply of oil. Big deal. Does that mean we are going to destroy other natural resources like fresh water and tamper with people's home water supply that they bathe their children with? It's not worth it.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

North America doesn't have their own supply of oil. Big deal. Does that mean we are going to destroy other natural resources like fresh water and tamper with people's home water supply that they bathe their children with? It's not worth it.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

North America doesn't have their own supply of oil. Big deal. Does that mean we are going to destroy other natural resources like fresh water and tamper with people's home water supply that they bathe their children with? It's not worth it.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Bryan Cones Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis 525 South State Street Unit#1314B Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone 29 Chateau Rd Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Erin Carman-Sweeney 41 Caretaker Road Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. The 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

The 60-day review period should not begin until IDNR deems the application complete Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

The 60-day review period should not begin until IDNR deems the application complete Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

This comment relates to 245.230, the time period for permit review by IDNR. The time period for IDNR should not begin until the applicant has submitted a complete application. IDNR needs to have a complete application to fully evaluate whether a permit will be granted. If the applicant submits an incomplete application, that should not prevent IDNR from giving it the full 60 day review necessary.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

This in America? Several Fracking incidents have forced people out their homes, in Texas and Pennsylvania. Are we going to really destroy families because we no longer want to go to another country for oil? Now that prosperous and cold hearted. My family as well as everyone else family should be kept from those harms. While corporations are thinking profit, guess who has to really pay? We do. Guess who has to breathe in that air? We do. We should stop letting corporations control what they do to us. We are all born on this earth as equals. Why should I let a man , one who bleeds the same blood I do, decide whether I should die or move from even move from my home state for his benefits and profits ?That is so preposterous!!!! Fracking shouldn't come to Illinois. They will not respect the regulations that come with Fracking because they have already proved that they will not.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker 525 S State St Chicago , IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

This in America? Several Fracking incidents have forced people out their homes, in Texas and Pennsylvania. Are we going to really destroy families because we no longer want to go to another country for oil? Now that prosperous and cold hearted. My family as well as everyone else family should be kept from those harms. While corporations are thinking profit, guess who has to really pay? We do. Guess who has to breathe in that air? We do. We should stop letting corporations control what they do to us. We are all born on this earth as equals. Why should I let a man , one who bleeds the same blood I do, decide whether I should die or move from even move from my home state for his benefits and profits ?That is so preposterous!!!! Fracking shouldn't come to Illinois. They will not respect the regulations that come with Fracking because they have already proved that they will not.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker 525 S State St Chicago , IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

This in America? Several Fracking incidents have forced people out their homes, in Texas and Pennsylvania. Are we going to really destroy families because we no longer want to go to another country for oil? Now that prosperous and cold hearted. My family as well as everyone else family should be kept from those harms. While corporations are thinking profit, guess who has to really pay? We do. Guess who has to breathe in that air? We do. We should stop letting corporations control what they do to us. We are all born on this earth as equals. Why should I let a man , one who bleeds the same blood I do, decide whether I should die or move from even move from my home state for his benefits and profits ?That is so preposterous!!!! Fracking shouldn't come to Illinois. They will not respect the regulations that come with Fracking because they have already proved that they will not.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker 525 S State St Chicago , IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

This in America? Several Fracking incidents have forced people out their homes, in Texas and Pennsylvania. Are we going to really destroy families because we no longer want to go to another country for oil? Now that prosperous and cold hearted. My family as well as everyone else family should be kept from those harms. While corporations are thinking profit, guess who has to really pay? We do. Guess who has to breathe in that air? We do. We should stop letting corporations control what they do to us. We are all born on this earth as equals. Why should I let a man , one who bleeds the same blood I do, decide whether I should die or move from even move from my home state for his benefits and profits ?That is so preposterous!!!! Fracking shouldn't come to Illinois. They will not respect the regulations that come with Fracking because they have already proved that they will not.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker 525 S State St Chicago , IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

This in America? Several Fracking incidents have forced people out their homes, in Texas and Pennsylvania. Are we going to really destroy families because we no longer want to go to another country for oil? Now that prosperous and cold hearted. My family as well as everyone else family should be kept from those harms. While corporations are thinking profit, guess who has to really pay? We do. Guess who has to breathe in that air? We do. We should stop letting corporations control what they do to us. We are all born on this earth as equals. Why should I let a man , one who bleeds the same blood I do, decide whether I should die or move from even move from my home state for his benefits and profits ?That is so preposterous!!!! Fracking shouldn't come to Illinois. They will not respect the regulations that come with Fracking because they have already proved that they will not.

Sincerely, Gigi Baker 525 S State St Chicago , IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

Though I understand that what you have proposed is just a draft, even drafts should have sources and consult the science behind this environmentally harmful and stressful process. The papers I mentioned that I am currently writing for a few finals require several steps. First, I have to choose a topic (this is easy for you since the topic of hydraulic fracturing has “been assigned” to you). Next, I have to brainstorm how I am going to go about writing my paper including: what points I want to convey, what side I am taking (if it is an argumentative paper), how I am going to convey the points I am making, etcetera. Then there is the outline: I have to structure my paper in an outline format, consider what sources I am going to use, and transition my paper between sections to allow a flow easy for the reader to follow. The first draft comes next. This is basically my whole paper, with perhaps a few improvements to be made along the way. Ultimately, it follows the format of my proposed outline and it includes all the sources I have collected and found appropriate to be implemented into my paper. Several drafts may occur until, finally, I find my paper to be adequate enough to be turned in and graded! Again, I understand that these proposed rules are just a draft, but it seems to me that it is a very insufficient first draft especially because it does not include “sources of underlying data, resources, etc”. How can you hope to construct a document such as this without such sources? Everything you have proposed should be thrown out because it has not consulted studies. This is of course the main point I am making. However, the only reason that I can assume your rules and regulations are so ill prepared is that you must have preferred to get assigned the other side of this topic. You are proposing rules and regulations so that hydraulic fracturing can start taking place in Illinois, but perhaps it would have been easier for you to write about why it should not be coming to Illinois, I am sure you would have found plenty of sources on that!

Sincerely, Lou Bass Richton Park , IL 60471

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.” Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming.Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, “under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete.”Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn’t stop the 60- day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing.Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department’s 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.230 Permit Application Receipt and Department Review

WE ARE HALFWAY THROUGH THE COMMENT PERIOD!! Thank you--all of you--who have submitted comments. We wish we could tell you that we've run out of things that are wrong with the Rules, but as we work our way through them, we are sadly finding many things that pose risks to public health and safey. So keep your comments coming. Section 1-35 (f) of the Law states that the applicant must certify, "under penalty of perjury that the application is true, accurate, and complete." Subsection 245.230(d) & (e) of the Rules gives the Department 60 days to review and approve or reject the permit. If, during that time, the Department deems the application is NOT complete, it is to notify the applicant in writing of the deficiencies and allow the applicant to correct them. But it doesn't stop the 60-day clock from ticking. This is important because the 60-day review period runs parallel to the period of time the public has to prepare for a public hearing. The rules, as written, invite abuse by unscrupulous applicants who could submit incomplete applications and withhold permit information until late in the process, thereby cheating the public out of valuable time needed to review the application and prepare for a hearing. Revisions Needed: This section should provide that the Department's 60-day review period does not begin until the application is deemed complete by the Department. This would be allowable under the law as the law affords applicants the option of waiving the 60 days on its own accord or at the request of the Department. If the Department finds the application to be incomplete, it could (and should) request the applicant waive the 60 day requirement, commencing it only after the application deficiency is cured. Failure by the applicant to comply with this request should be viewed by the Department as grounds for rejecting the application and denying the permit. The public comment period would, simultaneously be postponed to match the new timeframe.

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bayee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bayee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence.The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Catherine Lind Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Panelli Juliana 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Sarah Shelton Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

245.270.i states that parties requesting the public hearing and, if applicable, petitioning to participate in the public hearing shall have the burden of establishing the validity of their objections and concerns through the introduction of credible evidence. The standard of proof is the preponderance of the evidence. The provision concerning burden of proof in this subsection does not make sense in context. In fact, it reverses the burden that otherwise applies to permit applicants; it is the permit applicant who must demonstrate that they are entitled to a permit. It should not be the hearing requestor's burden to prove that the issues they raise are worthy of consideration. To the extent that the person or persons requesting the hearing raise legitimate questions as to whether a permit should be issued—or issued with particular conditions—it must be the applicant's responsibility to address those questions to the satisfaction of the Department.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

According to Earthworksaction.org: "Hydraulic fracturing - What it is Geologic formations may contain large quantities of oil or gas, but have a poor flow rate due to low permeability, or from damage or clogging of the formation during drilling. This is particularly true for tight sands, shales and coalbed methane formations. Hydraulic fracturing (aka fracking, which rhymes with cracking) stimulates wells drilled into these formations, making profitable otherwise prohibitively expensive extraction. Within the past decade, the combination of hydraulic fracturing with horizontal drilling has opened up shale deposits across the country and brought large-scale natural gas drilling to new regions. The fracking process occurs after a well has been drilled and steel pipe (casing) has been inserted in the well bore. The casing is perforated within the target zones that contain oil or gas, so that when the fracturing fluid is injected into the well it flows through the perforations into the target zones. Eventually, the target formation will not be able to absorb the fluid as quickly as it is being injected. At this point, the pressure created causes the formation to crack or fracture. Once the fractures have been created, injection ceases and the fracturing fluids begin to flow back to the surface. Materials called proppants (e.g., usually sand or ceramic beads), which were injected as part of the frac fluid mixture, remain in the target formation to hold open the fractures. Typically, a mixture of water, proppants and chemicals is pumped into the rock or coal formation. There are, however, other ways to fracture wells. Sometimes fractures are created by injecting gases such as propane or nitrogen, and sometimes acidizing occurs simultaneously with fracturing. Acidizing involves pumping acid (usually hydrochloric acid), into the formation to dissolve some of the rock material to clean out pores and enable gas and fluid to flows more readily into the well. Some studies have shown that anywhere from 20-85% of fracking fluids may remain underground. Used fracturing fluids that return to the surface are often referred to as flowback, and these wastes are typically stored in open pits or tanks at the well site prior to disposal. Hydraulic fracturing - Issues and impacts The process of fracturing a well is far from benign. The following sections provide an overview of some of the issues and impacts related to this well stimulation technique. Fracking operation, Grass Mesa, Colorado. Photo Credit: Peggy Utesch. Fracking operation, Grass Mesa, Colorado. Photo Credit: Peggy Utesch. Water use Sand and proppants Toxic chemicals Health concerns Surface water and soil contamination Groundwater contamination Air quality Waste disposal Chemical disclosure Water Use In 2010, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimated that 70 to 140 billion gallons of water are used to fracture 35,000 wells in the United States each year. This is approximately the annual water consumption of 40 to 80 cities each with a population of 50,000. Fracture treatments in coalbed methane wells use from 50,000 to 350,000 gallons of water per well, while deeper horizontal shale wells can use anywhere from 2 to 10 million gallons of water to fracture a single well. The extraction of so much water for fracking has raised concerns about the ecological impacts to aquatic resources, as well as dewatering of drinking water aquifers. It has been estimated that the transportation of a million gallons of water (fresh or waste water) requires 200 truck trips. Thus, not only does water used for hydraulic fracturing deplete fresh water supplies and impact aquatic habitat,

the transportation of so much water also creates localized air quality, safety and road repair issues. Sand and Proppants Conventional oil and gas wells use, on average, 300,000 pounds of proppant, coalbed fracture treatments use anywhere from 75,000 to 320,000 pounds of proppant and shale gas wells can use more than 4 million pounds of proppant per well. Frac sand mines are springing up across the country, from Wisconsin to Texas, bringing with them their own set of impacts. Mining sand for proppant use generates its own range of impacts, including water consumption and air emissions, as well as potential health problems related to crystalline silica. Toxic Chemicals In addition to large volumes of water, a variety of chemicals are used in hydraulic fracturing fluids. The oil and gas industry and trade groups are quick to point out that chemicals typically make up just 0.5 and 2.0% of the total volume of the fracturing fluid. When millions of gallons of water are being used, however, the amount of chemicals per fracking operation is very large. For example, a four million gallon fracturing operation would use from 80 to 330 tons of chemicals.[1] As part of New York State's Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement (SGEIS) related to Horizontal Drilling and High-Volume Hydraulic Fracturing in the Marcellus Shale, the Department of Environmental Conservation complied a list of chemicals and additives used during hydraulic fracturing. The table below provides examples of various types of hydraulic fracturing additives proposed for use in New York. Chemicals in brackets [ ] have not been proposed for use in the state, but are known to be used in other states or shale formations. ADDITIVE TYPE DESCRIPTION OF PURPOSE EXAMPLES OF CHEMICALS Proppant "Props" open fractures and allows gas / fluids to flow more freely to the well bore. Sand [Sintered bauxite; zirconium oxide; ceramic beads] Acid Cleans up perforation intervals of cement and drilling mud prior to fracturing fluid injection, and provides accessible path to formation. Hydrochloric acid (HCl, 3% to 28%) or muriatic acid Breaker Reduces the viscosity of the fluid in order to release proppant into fractures and enhance the recovery of the fracturing fluid. Peroxydisulfates Bactericide / Biocide Inhibits growth of organisms that could produce gases (particularly hydrogen sulfide) that could contaminate methane gas. Also prevents the growth of bacteria which can reduce the ability of the fluid to carry proppant into the fractures. Gluteraldehyde; 2-Bromo-2-nitro-1,2-propanediol Buffer / pH Adjusting Agent Adjusts and controls the pH of the fluid in order to maximize the effectiveness of other additives such as crosslinkers. Sodium or potassium carbonate; acetic acid Clay Stabilizer / Control Prevents swelling and migration of formation clays which could block pore spaces thereby reducing permeability. Salts (e.g., tetramethyl ammonium chloride) [Potassium chloride] Corrosion Inhibitor Reduces rust formation on steel tubing, well casings, tools, and tanks (used only in fracturing fluids that contain acid). Methanol; ammonium bisulfate for Oxygen Scavengers Crosslinker The fluid viscosity is increased using phosphate esters combined with metals. The metals are referred to as crosslinking agents. The increased fracturing fluid viscosity allows the fluid to carry more proppant into the fractures. Potassium hydroxide; borate salts Friction Reducer Allows fracture fluids to be injected at optimum rates and pressures by minimizing friction. Sodium acrylate-acrylamide copolymer; polyacrylamide (PAM); petroleum distillates Gelling Agent Increases fracturing fluid viscosity, allowing the fluid to carry more proppant into the fractures. Guar gum; petroleum distillate Iron Control Prevents the precipitation of carbonates and sulfates (calcium carbonate, calcium sulfate, barium sulfate) which could plug off the formation. Ammonium chloride; ethylene glycol; polyacrylate Solvent Additive which is soluble in oil, water & acid-based treatment fluids

which is used to control the wettability of contact surfaces or to prevent or break emulsions. Various aromatic hydrocarbons Surfactant Reduces fracturing fluid surface tension thereby aiding fluid recovery. Methanol; isopropanol; ethoxylated alcohol Many fracturing fluid chemicals are known to be toxic to humans and wildlife, and several are known to cause cancer. Potentially toxic substances include petroleum distillates such as kerosene and diesel fuel (which contain benzene, ethylbenzene, toluene, xylene, naphthalene and other chemicals); polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons; methanol; formaldehyde; ethylene glycol; glycol ethers; hydrochloric acid; and sodium hydroxide. Very small quantities of some fracking chemicals are capable of contaminating millions of gallons of water. According to the Environmental Working Group, petroleum-based products known as petroleum distillates such as kerosene (also known as hydrotreated light distillates, mineral spirits, and a petroleum distillate blends) are likely to contain benzene, a known human carcinogen that is toxic in water at levels greater than five parts per billion (or 0.005 parts per million). Other chemicals, such as 1,2-Dichloroethane are volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Volatile organic constituents have been shown to be present in fracturing fluid flowback wastes at levels that exceed drinking water standards. For example, testing of flowback samples from Pennsylvania have revealed concentrations of 1,2-Dichloroethane as high as 55.3 micrograms per liter, which is more than 10 times EPA's Maximum Contaminant Level for 1,2-Dichloroethane in drinking water. VOCs not only pose a health concern while in the water, the volatile nature of the constituents means that they can also easily enter the air. According to researchers at the University of Pittsburgh's Center for Healthy Environments and Communities, organic compounds brought to the surface in the fracturing flowback or produced water often go into open impoundments (frac ponds), where the volatile organic chemicals can offgas into the air. When companies have an excess of unused hydraulic fracturing fluids, they either use them at another job or dispose of them. Some Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs) include information on disposal options for fracturing fluids and additives. The table below summarizes the disposal considerations that the company Schlumberger Technology Corp. ("Schlumberger") includes in its MSDSs.[2] Schlumberger Fracking Waste Disposal Chart As seen in the table, Schlumberger recommends that many fracturing fluid chemicals be disposed of at hazardous waste facilities. Yet these same fluids (in diluted form) are allowed to be injected directly into or adjacent to USDWs. Under the Safe Drinking Water Act, hazardous wastes may not be injected into USDWs. Moreover, even if hazardous wastes are decharacterized (for example, diluted with water so that they are rendered nonhazardous), wastes must still be injected into a formation that is below the USDW. Clearly, some hydraulic fracturing fluids contain chemicals deemed to be "hazardous wastes." Even if these chemicals are diluted it is unconscionable that EPA is allowing these substances to be injected directly into underground sources of drinking water. Health Concerns Human exposure to fracking chemicals can occur by ingesting chemicals that have spilled and entered drinking water sources, through direct skin contact with the chemicals or wastes (e.g., by workers, spill responders or health care professionals), or by breathing in vapors from flowback wastes stored in pits or tanks. In 2010, Theo Colborn and three co-authors published a paper entitled Natural Gas Operations from a Public Health Perspective. Colborn and her co-authors summarized health effect information for 353 chemicals used to drill and fracture natural gas wells in the United States. Health effects were broken into 12 categories: skin, eye and sensory organ, respiratory, gastrointestinal and liver, brain and nervous

system, immune, kidney, cardiovascular and blood, cancer, mutagenic, endocrine disruption, other, and ecological effects. The chart below illustrates the possible health effects associated with the 353 natural gas-related chemicals for which Colborn and her co-authors were able to gather health-effects data. Colborn's paper provides a list of 71 particularly nasty drilling and fracturing chemicals, i.e., those that are associated with 10 or more health effects. Natural gas drilling and hydraulic fracturing chemicals with 10 or more health effects • 2,2',2"-Nitrilotriethanol • 2-Ethylhexanol • 5-Chloro-2-methyl-4-isothiazolin-3-one • Acetic acid • Acrolein • Acrylamide (2-propenamide) • Acrylic acid • Ammonia • Ammonium chloride • Ammonium nitrate • Aniline • Benzyl chloride • Boric acid • Cadmium • Calcium hypochlorite • Chlorine • Chlorine dioxide • Dibromoacetonitrile 1 • Diesel 2 • Diethanolamine • Diethylenetriamine • Dimethyl formamide • Epidian • Ethanol (acetylenic alcohol) • Ethyl mercaptan • Ethylbenzene • Ethylene glycol • Ethylene glycol monobutyl ether (2-BE) • Ethylene oxide • Ferrous sulfate • Formaldehyde • Formic acid • Fuel oil #2 • Glutaraldehyde • Glyoxal • Hydrodesulfurized kerosene • Hydrogen sulfide • Iron • Isobutyl alcohol (2-methyl-1-propanol) • Isopropanol (propan-2-ol) • Kerosene • Light naphthenic distillates, hydrotreated • Mercaptoacidic acid • Methanol • Methylene bis(thiocyanate) • Monoethanolamine • NaHCO3 • Naphtha, petroleum medium aliphatic • Naphthalene • Natural gas condensates • Nickel sulfate • Paraformaldehyde • Petroleum distillate naptha • Petroleum distillate/ naphtha • Phosphonium, tetrakis(hydroxymethyl)-sulfate • Propane-1,2-diol • Sodium bromate • Sodium chlorite (chlorous acid, sodium salt) • Sodium hypochlorite • Sodium nitrate • Sodium nitrite • Sodium sulfite • Styrene • Sulfur dioxide • Sulfuric acid • Tetrahydro-3,5-dimethyl-2H-1,3,5-thiadiazine-2-thione (Dazomet) • Titanium dioxide • Tributyl phosphate • Triethylene glycol • Urea • Xylene While Colborn and her co-workers focused on chemicals used in natural gas development, the chemicals used to fracture oil wells are very similar or the same. Looking at some of the oil wells that have been developed in the Bakken Shale in North Dakota, the fracturing fluid mixtures include some of the chemicals shown by Colborn to have the potential to cause 10 or more adverse health effects. Information posted hydraulic fracturing fluid chemicals on the FracFocus web site indicates that Bakken Shale oil wells may contain toxic chemicals such as hydrotreated light distillate, methanol, ethylene glycol, 2- butoxyethanol (2-BE), phosphonium, tetrakis(hydroxymethyl)-sulfate (aka phosphonic acid), acetic acid, ethanol, and napthlene.[3] Surface Water and Soil Contamination Spills of fracturing chemicals and wastes during transportation, fracturing operations and waste disposal have contaminated soil and surface waters. This section provides a few examples of spills related to hydraulic fracturing that have led to environmental impacts. Two spills kill fish: In September 2009, Cabot Oil and Gas spilled hydraulic fracturing fluid gel LGC-35 twice at the company's Heitsman gas well. The two incidents released a total of 8,000 gallons of the fracturing fluid, polluting Stevens Creek and resulting in a fish kill. LGC-35, a well lubricant used during the fracturing process. A third spill of LGC-35 occurred a week later, but did not enter the creek. Fracturing fluid taints a high quality watershed: In December 2009, a wastewater pit overflowed at Atlas Resources' Cowden 17 gas well, and an unknown quantity of hydraulic fracturing fluid wastes entered Dunkle Run, a "high quality watershed". The company failed to report the spill. In August 2010 the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) levied a $97,350 fine against Atlas Resources Another fracturing fluid spill impacts a high quality waterway: In May 2010, Range Resources was fined was fined $141,175 for failing to immediately notify the

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection when the company spilled 250 barrels of diluted fracturing fluids due to a broken joint in a transmission line. The fluids flowed into an unnamed tributary of Brush Run, killing at least 168 fish, salamanders and frogs. The watercourse is designated as a warm-water fishery under Pennsylvania's special protection waters program. Fracturing fluids affect soil and irrigation ditch: In October 2005 a valve on the wellhead of a Kerr-McGee well in Colorado failed. As a result, between168 and 210 gallons of flowback fluids sprayed into the air and drifted offsite, primarily onto pasture land, resulting in a visible coating that was as much as 1/2 inch thick. Groundwater Contamination As mentioned previously, hydraulic fracturing is used in many coalbed methane (CBM) production areas. Some coal beds contain groundwater of high enough quality to be considered underground sources of drinking water (USDWs). EPA list of chemicals in fracking fluids from 2002 draft of fracking study. Chemicals in fracking fluids. Source: EPA Click to view larger version In 2004, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released a final study on Evaluation of Impacts to Underground Sources of Drinking Water by Hydraulic Fracturing of Coalbed Methane Reservoirs. In the study, EPA found that ten out of eleven CBM basins in the U.S. are located, at least in part, within USDWs. Furthermore, the EPA determined that in some cases, hydraulic fracturing chemicals are injected directly into USDWs during the course of normal fracturing operations. (Read Laura Amos's story to learn how hydraulic fracturing has affected her family's life.) Calculations performed by EPA in the draft version of its study show that at least nine hydraulic fracturing chemicals may be injected into or close to USDWs at concentrations that pose a threat to human health. The chart below is a reproduction of the data from the EPA draft study. As seen in the chart, chemicals may be injected at concentrations that are anywhere from 4 to almost 13,000 times the acceptable concentration in drinking water. Not only does the injection of these chemicals pose a short-term threat to drinking water quality, it is quite possible that there could be long-term negative consequences for USDWs from these fracturing fluids. According to the EPA study, studies conducted by the oil and gas industry, and interviews with industry and regulators, 20 to 85% of fracturing fluids may remain in the formation, which means the fluids could continue to be a source of groundwater contamination for years to come. The potential long-term consequences of dewatering and hydraulic fracturing on water resources have been summed up by professional hydrogeologist who spent 32 years with the U.S. Geological Survey: At greatest risk of contamination are the coalbed aquifers currently used as sources of drinking water. For example, in the Powder River Basin (PRB) the coalbeds are the best aquifers. CBM production in the PRB will destroy most of these water wells; BLM predicts drawdowns...that will render the water wells in the coal unusable because the water levels will drop 600 to 800 feet. The CBM production in the PRB is predicted to be largely over by the year 2020. By the year 2060 water levels in the coalbeds are predicted to have recovered to within 95% of their current levels; the coalbeds will again become useful aquifers. However, contamination associated with hydrofracturing in the basin could threaten the usefulness of the aquifers for future use. As mentioned previously, anywhere from 20-85% of fracking fluids remain in the ground. Some fracturing gels remain stranded in the formation, even when companies have tried to flush out the gels using water and strong acids. Also, studies show that gelling agents in hydraulic fracturing fluids decrease the permeability of coals, which is the opposite of what hydraulic fracturing is supposed to do (i.e., increase the permeability of the coal formations). Other similar, unwanted side

effects from water- and chemical-based fracturing include: solids plugging up the cracks; water retention in the formation; and chemical reactions between the formation minerals and stimulation fluids. All of these cause a reduction in the permeability in the geological formations. For more details on the studies that have looked at stranded fracturing fluids and the potential for hydraulic fracturing to affect underground sources of drinking water, see Our Drinking Water at Risk, Oil and Gas Accountability Project's review of the EPA's study on the impacts of hydraulic fracturing of coalbed methane reservoirs on drinking water. Air Quality In many oil and gas producing regions, there has been a degradation of air quality as drilling increases. For example, in Texas, high levels of benzene have been measured in the air near wells in the Barnett Shale gas fields. These volatile air toxics may be originating from a variety of gas-field source such as separators, dehydrators, condensers, compressors, chemical spills, and leaking pipes and valves. Increasingly, research is being conducted on the potential air emissions released during the fracturing flow back stage, when wastewater returns to the surface. Shales contain numerous organic hydrocarbons, and additional chemicals are injected underground during shale gas drilling, well stimulation (e.g., hydraulic fracturing), and well workovers. The Pittsburgh University Center for Healthy Environments and Communities (CHEC) has been examining how organic compounds in the shale can be mobilized during fracturing and gas extraction processes. According to the CHEC researchers, these organic compounds are brought to the surface in the fracturing flowback or produced water, and often go into open impoundments (frac ponds), where the waste water, “will offgas its organic compounds into the air. This becomes an air pollution problem, and the organic compounds are now termed Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAP’s).” The initial draft of the New York draft supplemental environmental impacts statement related to drilling in the Marcellus Shale (which is no longer available on-line) included information on modeling of potential air impacts from fracturing fluid wastes stored in centralized impoundments. One analysis looked at the volatile organic compound methanol, which is known to be present in fracturing fluids such as surfactants, cross-linkers, scale inhibitors and iron control additives. The state calculated that a centralized fracturing flowback waste impoundment serving 10 wells (5 million gallons of flowback per well) could have an annual emission of 32.5 tons of methanol. The U.S. EPA reports that “chronic inhalation or oral exposure to methanol may result in headache, dizziness, giddiness, insomnia, nausea, gastric disturbances, conjunctivitis, visual disturbances (blurred vision), and blindness in humans.” Open pits, tanks or impoundments that accept flowback wastes from one well would have a much smaller emission of volatile organic compounds (VOC) like methanol than facilities accepting wastes from multiple wells. But there are centralized flowback facilities like those belonging to Range Resources in Washington County, Pennsylvania that have been designed for “long-term use,” and thus, are likely to accept wastes from more than one well. New York’s air modeling further suggested that the emission of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs) from centralized flowback impoundments could exceed ambient air thresholds 1,000 meters (3,300 feet) from the impoundment, and could cause the impoundment to qualify as a major source of HAPs. Methanol is just one of the VOCs contained in flowback water. The combined emissions from all VOCs present in flowback stored at centralized impoundments could be very large, depending on the composition of the fracturing fluids used at the wells. Data released on flowback water from wells in Pennsylvania reveal that numerous volatile organic chemicals are returning to the surface, sometime in high concentrations.

The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection looked for 70 volatile organic compounds in flowback, and 27 different chemicals showed up. In a health effects analysis conducted by Theo Colborn and others, 37% of the chemicals used during natural gas drilling, fracturing and production (for which health data were available) were found to be volatile, with the ability to become airborne. Colborn and her co-authors compared the potential health impacts of volatile chemicals with those chemicals more like to be found in water (i.e., chemicals with high solubilities). They found that “far more of the volatile chemicals (81%) can cause harm to the brain and nervous system. Seventy one percent of the volatile chemicals can harm the cardiovascular system and blood, and 66% can harm the kidneys,” producing a profile that “displays a higher frequency of health effects than the water soluble chemicals.” The researchers add that the chance of exposures to volatile chemicals are increased by case they can be inhaled, ingested and absorbed through the skin. Citizens of the gas field are experiencing health effects related to volatile chemicals from pits. In 2005, numerous Colorado residents experienced severe odors and health impacts related to flowback and drilling pits and tanks in Garfield County. According to Dion and Debbie Enlow complained to the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission about odors from a Barrett wellpad upwind from their home. The pad had four wells that were undergoing completion/hydraulic fracturing. Dion Enlow complained to the company that the smell was so bad that "I can't go outside and breathe." In Pennsylvania, a fracturing flowback wastewater pit just beyond June Chappel’s property line created odors similar to gasoline and kerosene, which forced her inside, left a greasy film on her windows, on one occasion created a white dust that fell over her yard. Chappel and her neighbors lived with the noxious odors until they hired an attorney and Range Resources agreed to remove the impoundment. In March 2010, a fracturing flowback wastewater impoundment in Washington County, Pennsylvania caught fire and exploded producing a cloud of thick, black smoke that could be seen miles away. For several days prior to the explosion nearby citizens had tried to alert state officials about noxious odors from the impoundment that were sickening their families, but “their voicemail boxes were full.” Waste Disposal It has been reported that anywhere from 25 – 100% of the chemical-laced hydraulic fracturing fluids return to the surface from Marcellus Shale operations. This means that for some shale gas wells, millions of gallons of wastewater are generated, and require either treatment for re-use, or disposal. In 2009, the volume of fracturing flowback and brines produced in Pennsylvania was estimated to be 9 million gallons of wastewater per day, and this figure was expected to increase to 19 - 20 million gallons/day in 2011. The sheer volume of wastes, combined with high concentrations of certain chemicals in the flowback from fracturing operations, are posing major waste management challenges for the Marcellus Shale states. Also, the US Geological Survey has found that flowback may contain a variety of formation materials, including brines, heavy metals, radionuclides, and organics, which can make wastewater treatment difficult and expensive. According to an article in ProPublica, New York City’s Health Department has raised concerns about the concentrations of radioactive materials in wastewater from natural gas wells. In a July, 2009 letter obtained by ProPublica, the Department wrote that “Handling and disposal of this wastewater could be a public health concern.” The letter also mentioned that the state may have difficulty disposing of the waste, that thorough testing will be needed at water treatment plants, and that workers may need to be monitored for radiation as much as they might be at nuclear facilities. Options for disposal of radioactive flowback or

produced water include underground injection in Class II UIC wells and offsite treatment. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has indicated that Class II UIC injection disposal wells are uncommon in New York, and existing wells aren't licensed to receive radioactive waste. In terms of offsite treatment, it is not known if any of New York's water treatment facilities are capable of handling radioactive wastewater. ProPublica contacted several plant managers in central New York who said they could not take the waste or were not familiar with state regulations. Pennsylvania state regulators and the natural gas industry are also facing challenges regarding how to ensure proper disposal of the millions of gallons of chemical-laced wastewater generated daily from hydraulic fracturing and gas production in the Marcellus shale. Drinking water treatment facilities in Pennsylvania are not equipped to treat and remove many flowback contaminants, but rather, rely on dilution of chlorides, sulfates and other chemicals in surface waters used for drinking water supplies. During the fall of 2008, the disposal of large volumes of flowback and produced water at publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) contributed to high total dissolved solids (TDS) levels measured in Pennsylvania's Monongahela River and its tributaries. Studies showed that in addition to the Monongahela River, many of the other rivers and streams in Pennsylvania had a very limited ability to assimilate additional TDS, sulfate and chlorides, and that the high concentrations of these constituents were harming aquatic communities. Research by Carnegie Mellon University and Pittsburgh Water and Sewer Authority experts suggests that the natural gas industry has contributed to elevated levels of bromide in the Allegheny and Beaver Rivers. Bromides react with disinfectants used by municipal treatment plants to create brominated trihalomethanes, which have been linked to several types of cancer and birth defects. In August of 2010, Pennsylvania enacted new rules limiting the discharge of wastewater from gas drilling to 500 milligrams per liter of total dissolved solids (TDS) and 250 milligrams per liter for chlorides. The number of municipal facilities allowed to take drilling and fracking wastewater has dropped from 27 in 2010 to 15 in 2011. Disposal of drilling and fracking waste water is going to continue to present a challenge to local and state governments as more wells are developed across the country. Chemical Disclosure One potentially frustrating issue for surface owners is that it has not been easy to find out what chemicals are being used during the hydraulic fracturing operations in your neighborhood. According to the Natural Resources Defense Council, in the late 1990s and early 2000s attempts by various environmental and ranching advocacy organizations to obtain chemical compositions of hydraulic fracturing fluids were largely unsuccessful because oil and gas companies refused to reveal this "proprietary information." In the mid-2000s, the Oil and Gas Accountability Project and The Endocrine Disruption Exchange (TEDX) began to compile information on drilling and fracturing chemicals from a number of sources, including Material Safety Data Sheets obtained through Freedom of Information Act requests of state agencies. TEDX subsequently produced reports on the toxic chemicals used in oil and gas development in several western states including Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming and Colorado, and worked with the Environmental Working Group to produce a report on chemicals injected into oil and gas wells in Colorado. In 2006, the first effort to require disclosure of chemicals was launched. In June of 2006, the Oil and Gas Accountability Project submitted a letter to the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (COGCC) and the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) on behalf of five citizens organizations in Colorado. The groups asked that state agencies require disclosure

of the chemicals used and monitoring of chemicals and wastes released by the oil and gas industry in Colorado. Since that time the Oil and Gas Accountability Project and others have worked to get disclosure bills passed in states across the country. Wyoming, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Michigan and Texas now require a certain level of disclosure, although trade secret laws still prevent full disclosure in most states. Hydraulic Fracturing Best Practices From a public health perspective, if hydraulic fracturing stimulation takes place, the best option is to fracture formations using sand and water without any additives, or sand and water with non-toxic additives. Non-toxic additives are be

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Applicants should be held accountable for their plans BEFORE they are put into action. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Mary Peplinski 545 Woodcrest Dr Mundelein, IL 60060

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Dear IDNR, Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. There are some revisions needed. This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post-hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over. Kurt

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Exclusion of Some Fracking Wells Subpart H, Sections 245.830 245.850 The law requires all wastewater to be stored in tanks, and allows use of open pits ONLY for one week and ONLY when unexpectedly large volumes of wastewater come up from the well. The proposed rules, hover require NO accurate calculations for tank size, which means open pits could be come more the norm if they are undersized. They also allow wastewater to sit in open pits until operations are complete. This far exceeds the maximum 7 days allowed by regulations, which were designed to protect people and wildlife from exposure to hazardous chemicals. Revision Needed: Redraft to follow the law.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Fracking & drilling permits must take into account local geology. Southern Illinois is located between two major rivers & is near two potential earthquake faults. Past mining & drilling operations have left most Southern Illinois towns on near areas that are geologically unstable. The cave system in nearby Indiana goes for hundreds of miles. There should be a moratorium on new IL fracking permits in earthquake-prone or or other potentially hazardous disaster areas.

Sincerely, Mr Clint David Samuel 706 North Division Street Carterville, IL 62918

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Fracking causes a number of bad and permanent consequences to the environment. It causes pollution of local water supplies with its influx of chemicals, affecting local residents, but possibly other users connected to the same water system. It causes earthquakes that damage people's homes and properties. The bad effects outweigh any good that fracking provides by extracting natural gas. Personally, I'm shocked that this practice is even legal. If it were up to me, I would make it a criminal offense across the board. At the very least, it needs stronger regulation, especially from local authorities.

Sincerely, Karen Stockwell 4229 N. Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Fracking causes a number of bad and permanent consequences to the environment. It causes pollution of local water supplies with its influx of chemicals, affecting local residents, but possibly other users connected to the same water system. It causes earthquakes that damage people's homes and properties. The bad effects outweigh any good that fracking provides by extracting natural gas. Personally, I'm shocked that this practice is even legal. If it were up to me, I would make it a criminal offense across the board. At the very least, it needs stronger regulation, especially from local authorities.

Sincerely, Karen Stockwell 4229 N. Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Fracking is such a horribly messy thing to do -- it degrades the environment, causes pollution, uses an unbelievable amount of water, uses carcinogenic chemicals, likely leaches into ground water, and possibly causes earthquakes due to the force used in doing the "fracking." How in the world can it be a good thing?

Sincerely, Bonnie Gahris Glen Ellyn, IL 601037

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Fracking is such a horribly messy thing to do -- it degrades the environment, causes pollution, uses an unbelievable amount of water, uses carcinogenic chemicals, likely leaches into ground water, and possibly causes earthquakes due to the force used in doing the "fracking." How in the world can it be a good thing?

Sincerely, Bonnie Gahris Glen Ellyn, IL 601037

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

I am concerned that the rush to secure short term profits has taken priority over the long term consequences of fracking. The potential for detrimental environmental, local economic, and public health outcomes is alarming, and the proposed rules do not adequately address the high cost of damage to our water supply. Fracking exploits a limited resource for a limited time. The water supply is more important and irreplaceable. We can survive without fracking; we cannot survive without water. Therefore, it is critical that any fracking allowed be limited to seismically stable areas away from water and protected natural areas. Please take the time to develop adequate environmental and safety regulations. The potential for unfixable accidents and contamination is too high to risk our limited natural resources. New energy sources are being found all the time. But no one can create water, which is essential for life. Carol Grom, Sleepy Hollow, IL

Sincerely, Evelyn Carol Grom 146 Hilltop Lane Sleepy Hollow, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

I don't know about the people who work for IDNR, but in Chicago, if you so much as add a brick to a wall on the building you own, you have to get a building permit. Period. Lord knows if you want to rezone something, that most definitely requires an additional public comment period. Now for the most part, if I want to add a basketball hoop or renovate my kitchen, then chances are the building modifications won't cause a significant amount of danger to my neighborhood or the greater Chicago area. Most businesses are not going to pose serious health risks to a residential area, or vice versa. However, modifications to a fracking operation could pose health risks for an entire community and therefore should require public notification. Certainly the modifications that should prompt a public hearing should not be limited to: 1.moving the well, including the horizontal well bore, 2. adding new horizontal well bores, or 3. adding length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." These limitations were not included in the Act passed by the General Assembly and were never intended by the statute they passed to regulate the industry, which suggested that a significant deviation from the original permit should prompt a permit modification, including public notification, commenting, and hearings. Clearly "significant deviation" should be defined, and the definition should be: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." Any specific examples of significant deviations described in the rules should be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Communities absolutely should be informed of any deviation from the original fracking permit and should be provided with additional opportunity to comment publicly.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

I don't like the way this is worded at all. It is taking our rights away from us. It is similar to guilty until proven innocent. It is not the way that I envision being treated by my own government.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

I don't like the way this is worded at all. It is taking our rights away from us. It is similar to guilty until proven innocent. It is not the way that I envision being treated by my own government.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

I don't like the way this is worded at all. It is taking our rights away from us. It is similar to guilty until proven innocent. It is not the way that I envision being treated by my own government.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

In Chicago, when the CTA wants to make major changes, they offer multiple hearings all over the city, so as to provide the people who use the CTA the opportunity to share their concerns. UIC's public hearings occur on all of their campuses. The CTA doesn't have hearings in Naperville just because maybe the employees live there. UIC doesn't have public meetings in DeKalb. That would be absurd. So why would a public hearing regarding a fracking operator's permit application occur outside of the community implicated by the application???? Section 245.270(b)(2) of the rules does not require that IDNR hold hearings for permit applications in counties that would be affected by the fracking operations for which the permit was applied. If the purpose of a hearing is to provide the public an opportunity to comment on and ask questions about a permit, why would you hold the hearing outside of the community in question? This makes no sense. Certainly if it is inconvenient for IDNR representatives to travel to the communities implicated by fracking permit applications, then certainly it is completely unreasonable to expect community members to travel great distances to voice their concerns in an area outside of their community. Thus permit application hearings should all be held in the county where the well for which the permit has been applied is to be located.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

In Chicago, when the CTA wants to make major changes, they offer multiple hearings all over the city, so as to provide the people who use the CTA the opportunity to share their concerns. UIC's public hearings occur on all of their campuses. The CTA doesn't have hearings in Naperville just because maybe the employees live there. UIC doesn't have public meetings in DeKalb. That would be absurd. So why would a public hearing regarding a fracking operator's permit application occur outside of the community implicated by the application???? Section 245.270(b)(2) of the rules does not require that IDNR hold hearings for permit applications in counties that would be affected by the fracking operations for which the permit was applied. If the purpose of a hearing is to provide the public an opportunity to comment on and ask questions about a permit, why would you hold the hearing outside of the community in question? This makes no sense. Certainly if it is inconvenient for IDNR representatives to travel to the communities implicated by fracking permit applications, then certainly it is completely unreasonable to expect community members to travel great distances to voice their concerns in an area outside of their community. Thus permit application hearings should all be held in the county where the well for which the permit has been applied is to be located.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

In Chicago, when the CTA wants to make major changes, they offer multiple hearings all over the city, so as to provide the people who use the CTA the opportunity to share their concerns. UIC's public hearings occur on all of their campuses. The CTA doesn't have hearings in Naperville just because maybe the employees live there. UIC doesn't have public meetings in DeKalb. That would be absurd. So why would a public hearing regarding a fracking operator's permit application occur outside of the community implicated by the application???? Section 245.270(b)(2) of the rules does not require that IDNR hold hearings for permit applications in counties that would be affected by the fracking operations for which the permit was applied. If the purpose of a hearing is to provide the public an opportunity to comment on and ask questions about a permit, why would you hold the hearing outside of the community in question? This makes no sense. Certainly if it is inconvenient for IDNR representatives to travel to the communities implicated by fracking permit applications, then certainly it is completely unreasonable to expect community members to travel great distances to voice their concerns in an area outside of their community. Thus permit application hearings should all be held in the county where the well for which the permit has been applied is to be located.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

In many states "home-rule" of resources has been negated. The resources beneath a person's home are no longer owned by the person purchasing the home, but are being held onto by the builders - and later sold for $ to oil and gas industries. Here is an article that discusses this issue: http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/09/us-usa-frackingrights- specialreport-idUSBRE9980AZ20131009 What type of safeguards are there being taken in the state of Illinois to ensure that a homeowner's land-value -- and home-values -- will be protected against such exploitation by builders and natural gas developers.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

In many states "home-rule" of resources has been negated. The resources beneath a person's home are no longer owned by the person purchasing the home, but are being held onto by the builders - and later sold for $ to oil and gas industries. Here is an article that discusses this issue: http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/09/us-usa-frackingrights- specialreport-idUSBRE9980AZ20131009 What type of safeguards are there being taken in the state of Illinois to ensure that a homeowner's land-value -- and home-values -- will be protected against such exploitation by builders and natural gas developers.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

In many states "home-rule" of resources has been negated. The resources beneath a person's home are no longer owned by the person purchasing the home, but are being held onto by the builders - and later sold for $ to oil and gas industries. Here is an article that discusses this issue: http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/09/us-usa-frackingrights- specialreport-idUSBRE9980AZ20131009 What type of safeguards are there being taken in the state of Illinois to ensure that a homeowner's land-value -- and home-values -- will be protected against such exploitation by builders and natural gas developers.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

In many states "home-rule" of resources has been negated. The resources beneath a person's home are no longer owned by the person purchasing the home, but are being held onto by the builders - and later sold for $ to oil and gas industries. Here is an article that discusses this issue: http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/09/us-usa-frackingrights- specialreport-idUSBRE9980AZ20131009 What type of safeguards are there being taken in the state of Illinois to ensure that a homeowner's land-value -- and home-values -- will be protected against such exploitation by builders and natural gas developers.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

It is imperative to tightly regulate fracking based on the terrible consequences it creates for the environment and our future health.

Sincerely, Megan N Berry Chicago, IL 60622

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

It is imperative to tightly regulate fracking based on the terrible consequences it creates for the environment and our future health.

Sincerely, Megan N Berry Chicago, IL 60622

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Liability / Burden of Proof Supart F, Section 245.620 The law presumes that water pollution found within 1500 feet of a tracking operation was caused by tracking (in other words, the burden lies on the tracking operator, not the person(s) impacted by the pollution to prove that the pollution came from any other sources. However, the rules limit the presumption to a much smaller set of "indicator" chemicals, rather than the list of more than 100 chemicals included in the law. This inappropriately favors the operator by placing the burden squarely on those affected in the event that the presence of one of the chemicals no longer listed is found. Revision needed: Modify the rules to follow the adopted law.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Liability / Burden of Proof Supart F, Section 245.620 The law presumes that water pollution found within 1500 feet of a tracking operation was caused by tracking (in other words, the burden lies on the tracking operator, not the person(s) impacted by the pollution to prove that the pollution came from any other sources. However, the rules limit the presumption to a much smaller set of "indicator" chemicals, rather than the list of more than 100 chemicals included in the law. This inappropriately favors the operator by placing the burden squarely on those affected in the event that the presence of one of the chemicals no longer listed is found. Revision needed: Modify the rules to follow the adopted law.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

More demands can make it harder for the petioner to seek and obtain public participation, There should be the requirement of only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

More demands can make it harder for the petioner to seek and obtain public participation, There should be the requirement of only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

No permits if a permit applicant fails to appear at a hearing. How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270)245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied. In other court cases, failure to appear either prompts dismissal of a case, or sanctions such as a warrant for arrest, fines and/or jail. An applicant should not be rewarded for failure to appear at a hearing; rather, deny the permit. Deny subsequent applications.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Public Notice Subpart C, Section 245.330 The regulations require significant modifications to permit to undergo public review processes, including notice, comment and public hearings. But the rules greatly narrow the type of modifications that require public processes - in other words, they open the door for tracking permit holders to pull a "bait and switch". This already is happening with coal mining in Illinois. Permits are changed (considered insignificant revision) and the public is not notified: One particularly egregious example of this relates to the approval of the injection of coal slurry into The state has already allowed the practice at the Crown Mine No. 3 near Girard, and the owner of the Shay No. 1 Mine near Carlinville - without public notice. The danger is serious enough that the practice of injecting coal slurry into the ground has been curtailed in West Virginia, where more than 100 lawsuits are pending by residents who blame coal companies for poisoning wells. Another example is Deer Run Mine, Deer Run mine where the operator used the Insignificant Permit Revision and Incidental Boundary Revision process to receive approval from IDNR to build the entire base of the High Hazard coal slurry impoundment and begin dumping coal slurry there before any opportunity for public comment, and before the mine received a dam permit from IDNR’s Office of Water Resources. Revision needed - Strengthen the language in the rules so that the public and the natural resource upon which we all depend are protected. Ensure that significant revisions strongly defined to avoid what's already happening in the Illinois coal basin - the same area that is likely to be impacted by hydrofracking.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Public Notice Subpart C, Section 245.330 The regulations require significant modifications to permit to undergo public review processes, including notice, comment and public hearings. But the rules greatly narrow the type of modifications that require public processes - in other words, they open the door for tracking permit holders to pull a "bait and switch". This already is happening with coal mining in Illinois. Permits are changed (considered insignificant revision) and the public is not notified: One particularly egregious example of this relates to the approval of the injection of coal slurry into The state has already allowed the practice at the Crown Mine No. 3 near Girard, and the owner of the Shay No. 1 Mine near Carlinville - without public notice. The danger is serious enough that the practice of injecting coal slurry into the ground has been curtailed in West Virginia, where more than 100 lawsuits are pending by residents who blame coal companies for poisoning wells. Another example is Deer Run Mine, Deer Run mine where the operator used the Insignificant Permit Revision and Incidental Boundary Revision process to receive approval from IDNR to build the entire base of the High Hazard coal slurry impoundment and begin dumping coal slurry there before any opportunity for public comment, and before the mine received a dam permit from IDNR’s Office of Water Resources. Revision needed - Strengthen the language in the rules so that the public and the natural resource upon which we all depend are protected. Ensure that significant revisions strongly defined to avoid what's already happening in the Illinois coal basin - the same area that is likely to be impacted by hydrofracking.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270)245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.270(n) reads "If the hearing decision determines that a valid objection or concern with the permit application exists such that there is a potential impact to the pending permit application, the applicant may attempt to correct the deficiencies and provide the Department any information required to address the valid objection or concern. If the applicant fails to provide adequate supplemental information to address a valid objection or concern, the Department may reject the application condition the permit accordingly. (Section 1-35(j) of the Act)" THE ADOPTED REGULATIONS ARE WEAK AND FAVOR THE APPLICANT. WHY DOESN'T THIS SECTION REQUIRE THE IDNR TO REJECT THE PERMIT IN THE EVENT A VALID OBJECTION OR CONCERN EXISTS AND THE APPLICANT FAILS TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION? THE WORD "MAY" IS DISCRETIONARY. REVISION NEEDED: THE WORD "MAY" SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH "SHALL".

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures 245.270 Public Hearings Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post-hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, baylee Champion chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, baylee Champion chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, baylee Champion chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted.Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270 requires the Department to appear at hearings but does not require that the Department testify. The rules should contain an express obligation that the Department testify—and testify under oath—and be available for cross-examination. Without such testimony, a primary purpose of the hearings – to vet the permit application and ensure transparency – is gutted. Revisions Needed: Subsection 245.270(g)(6) should be amended to specify not merely that a representative from the Department appear and "be given an opportunity" to provide evidence, but that the representative "shall testify under oath." Furthermore, considering the specificity the Department requires of citizens at each hearing, the Department must be equally prepared. In other words, the Department must provide a person or persons (with appropriate knowledge of specific areas) who will be able to address any issues that may arise at the hearing.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, David Klawitter 718 W James M Rochford Street (Room D910) Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Janet Elizabeth Donoghue 5082 Springer Ridge Rd Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ken Laundra Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ken Laundra Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ken Laundra Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ken Laundra Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process.It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings.Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process.It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings.Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process.It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings.Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process.It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings.Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Lauren keeling Chicago, IL 60614

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Lauren keeling Chicago, IL 60614

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Lauren keeling Chicago, IL 60614

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. HOW CAN QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC BE MEANINGFULLY ADDRESSED IF THE APPLICANT IS NOT THERE TO HEAR AND RESPOND TO THE QUESTION? ISN'T THAT THE INTENT OF THE PUBLIC HEARING IN THE FIRST PLACE? In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Mary Katherine Hughes Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj One Carley Ct. Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to…." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment. THIS SUGGESTED CHANGE IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT, GIVEN THE IDNR OFFICE OF MINEs AND MINERAL'S TRACK RECORD OF DETERMINING REVISIONS ARE INSIGNIFICANT IN INSTANCES WHERE COMMUNITIES OR RESIDENTS ARE AFFECTED. TWO EXAMPLES: 1. THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 80-FOOR TALL, HIGH-HAZARD COAL SLURRY IMPOUNDMENT IN HILLSBORO BY THE CLINE GROUP THAT COVERS ONE SQUARE MILE. THIS IS ADJACENT TO A HOSPITAL, SENIOR LIVING FACILITY AND DAY CARE CENTER; AND THE INJECTION OF COAL SLURRY UNDERGROUND IN NEARBY GIRARD (SAME OPERATOR). RESIDENTS ARE RIGHTLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROXIMITY OF THE IMPOUNDMENT TO VULNERABLE POPULATIONS IN THE EVENT THE WALLS SHOULD BREAK. THEY ARE CONCERNED ABOUT LOSS OF LIFE AND PROPERTY. AND THEY REPEATEDLY ASKED WHERE COAL SLURRY WOULD BE STORED DURING THE HEARING PROCESS. 2. THE INJECTION OF COAL SLURRY UNDERGROUND BY THE CLINE GROUP, WHO PLANNED TO GENERATE 750,000 TONS OF CLURRY A YEAR AT FULL PRODUCTION. THIS, TOO, WAS APPROVED AS AN INSIGNIFICANT REVISION. THE PRACTICE OF INJECTING COAL SLURRY UNDERGROUND HAS BEEN BANNED IN WEST VIRGINIA DUE TO ITS HEALTH IMPACTS (AT LEAST TEMPORARILY). CONCERNS INCLUDE CONTAMINATION OF GROUND WATER AND WELLS. THE PUBLIC HAS A RIGHT TO BE INFORMED AND ALLOWED TO COMMENT ON ACTIVITIES THAT AFFECT THEIR LIVES.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to…." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment. THIS SUGGESTED CHANGE IS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT, GIVEN THE IDNR OFFICE OF MINEs AND MINERAL'S TRACK RECORD OF DETERMINING REVISIONS ARE INSIGNIFICANT IN INSTANCES WHERE COMMUNITIES OR RESIDENTS ARE AFFECTED. TWO EXAMPLES: 1. THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 80-FOOR TALL, HIGH-HAZARD COAL SLURRY IMPOUNDMENT IN HILLSBORO BY THE CLINE GROUP THAT COVERS ONE SQUARE MILE. THIS IS ADJACENT TO A HOSPITAL, SENIOR LIVING FACILITY AND DAY CARE CENTER; AND THE INJECTION OF COAL SLURRY UNDERGROUND IN NEARBY GIRARD (SAME OPERATOR). RESIDENTS ARE RIGHTLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROXIMITY OF THE IMPOUNDMENT TO VULNERABLE POPULATIONS IN THE EVENT THE WALLS SHOULD BREAK. THEY ARE CONCERNED ABOUT LOSS OF LIFE AND PROPERTY. AND THEY REPEATEDLY ASKED WHERE COAL SLURRY WOULD BE STORED DURING THE HEARING PROCESS. 2. THE INJECTION OF COAL SLURRY UNDERGROUND BY THE CLINE GROUP, WHO PLANNED TO GENERATE 750,000 TONS OF CLURRY A YEAR AT FULL PRODUCTION. THIS, TOO, WAS APPROVED AS AN INSIGNIFICANT REVISION. THE PRACTICE OF INJECTING COAL SLURRY UNDERGROUND HAS BEEN BANNED IN WEST VIRGINIA DUE TO ITS HEALTH IMPACTS (AT LEAST TEMPORARILY). CONCERNS INCLUDE CONTAMINATION OF GROUND WATER AND WELLS. THE PUBLIC HAS A RIGHT TO BE INFORMED AND ALLOWED TO COMMENT ON ACTIVITIES THAT AFFECT THEIR LIVES.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tracy Noel 508 Pearl Marseilles, IL 61341

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute. Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to: move the well, including the horizontal well bore, add new horizontal well bores, or add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment. Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed non-exclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...." Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant.Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act."The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute.Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to:move the well, including the horizontal well bore,add new horizontal well bores, oradd length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores."While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment.Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed nonexclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...."Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant.Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act."The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute.Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to:move the well, including the horizontal well bore,add new horizontal well bores, oradd length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores."While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment.Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed nonexclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...."Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Section 245.330 narrows it's counterpart in the law and also sets up a system that keeps citizens largely in the dark about changes to permits that may well be significant.Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant. It states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act."The statute does not define what constitutes a "significant deviation," but the draft rules radically circumscribe the term, giving it a narrow and exclusive meaning that is found nowhere in, or supported by, the statute.Specifically, the draft rules define significant deviation only as those modifications that "propose to:move the well, including the horizontal well bore,add new horizontal well bores, oradd length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores."While these circumstances would certainly constitute significant deviations, so would many others. For instance, what about a modification calls for significantly more water use or water use from a different source even if the increased use fell short of a "serious risk" to public health or the environment.Revisions Needed: We recommend the NRDC's language to define a significant deviation: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." If specific examples are used to further flesh out this definition, those examples must be framed nonexclusively, i.e., employing the language "including but not limited to...."Citizens should be informed of these deviations and allowed opportunity for public comment.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Starting the clock over when deficiencies are identified at, or as a result of, the hearing. How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270)245.270 Public Hearings Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Starting the clock over when deficiencies are identified at, or as a result of, the hearing. Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.270 Public Hearings Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post-hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.270(b)(2) of the Rules gives the Department broad latitude regarding where to hold a hearing, including holding hearings outside the affected counties. It is imperative that the hearings be held IN the county where a well will be located. A location outside the affected county will not serve the public interest. It could create an enormous barrier to participation by ordinary citizens, who may not have the resources, time or child care options for out-of-town travel. Furthermore, out-of-county hearings limit the ability of ordinary citizens to call local witnesses, who may have critical information but be unable or unwilling to come to Springfield. Finally, out of county hearings impede the practicalityfor interested neighbors to attend and observe the hearing, defeating the purpose of ensuring transparency in the permitting process. It should not be difficult to identify locations where hearings can be held in affected counties. Courthouses, schools, and in some cases county board offices or town halls generally have space that could accommodate a hearing. Furthermore, with the availability and low cost of web-based technology, the Department should be able to appear remotely at a hearing being held in the affected county even if travel there is logistically impossible. But we posit that if it is too expensive or inconvenient for the Department to travel to hearings in counties that will be affected, then it is unfeasible to expect ordinary citizens to bear that burden by traveling to off-site counties to testify in hearings. Solution: Hold all hearings in the county in which a well is to be located.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures (245.200-245.270) 245.270 Public Hearings Section 245.270(f) of the rules allows a permit to be given EVEN IF the applicant has failed to appear at a hearing. This provision would gut the purpose of the public hearing requirement. In the event the failure was due to an emergency or circumstances beyond the applicant's control, the hearing should be rescheduled, and the 60-day time frame should start over to accommodate that rescheduling. If the applicant cannot show good cause for failure to appear at the hearing, the application should be denied.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Michael Lang 1206 N Elmwood Peoria, IL 61606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Subsection 245.270(n), allows the applicant to attempt to correct deficiencies identified at the hearing, but places no time limit on such correction. It also doesn't require the Department to provide public notice of such correction. As such, applicants could, in principle, provide information to the Department on Day 59 of the 60-day permit issuance period, and the public would not find out about it until long after the permit had been issued. Revisions Needed: This provision should specify a time window for applicants to provide corrections. It should also provide that the post- hearing public comment period must remain open for a sufficient number of days after that time window in order to provide the public adequate time to meaningfully review and comment on those corrections. It would not be unreasonable for deficiencies to be viewed as an incomplete application requiring that the 60-day clock start over.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute.Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules.Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Dolores C. Pino, B.A., J.D. 7200 Wilson Terrace Morton Grove, IL 60053-1142

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone 29 Chateau Rd Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone 29 Chateau Rd Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute.Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules.Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue.Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute.Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules.Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue.Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ryan Pilcher 1531 N. Talman Ave #1 Chicago, IL 60622

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The Illinois General Assembly's fracking regulatory act provides for the means by which anyone who could potentially be affected negatively by a fracking operation to petition for participation in a hearing on the fracking operator's permit application. Section 1- 50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act, it is quite simple: such an individual as who might fear that he/she might negatively be affected by a fracking operation need only petition IDNR for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules adds additional and unnecessary bureaucracy, requiring such an individual to petition the hearing officer, the department, and the applicant. This is a major inconsistency between the law and IDNR's rules and may result in reduced public participation in the hearing process--as was intended by the GA's Act. IDNR should follow the letter of the Act and simply require individuals who are or may be affected by a fracking permit application to petition IDNR only for a hearing.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The industry needs to reveal the chemical cocktail that they are using to extract the natural gas.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The industry needs to reveal the chemical cocktail that they are using to extract the natural gas.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The public need to participate when there's a fracker trying to use their water supply to get at natural gas. Show me even ONE corporation involved in this practice that cares about something other than profit. As long as they get their profit, that's all they care about. They don't care whom or what it hurts! Thanks to lobbyists, the General Assembly is fast-tracking it in, and soon we'll all be lighting our water on fire. Only a matter of time, folks. We the people can only express our disappointment in the people who are supposed to represent our interests.

Sincerely, Michael Lee Dotson 102 Anderson St., Apt. B Carterville, IL 62918

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

The public need to participate when there's a fracker trying to use their water supply to get at natural gas. Show me even ONE corporation involved in this practice that cares about something other than profit. As long as they get their profit, that's all they care about. They don't care whom or what it hurts! Thanks to lobbyists, the General Assembly is fast-tracking it in, and soon we'll all be lighting our water on fire. Only a matter of time, folks. We the people can only express our disappointment in the people who are supposed to represent our interests.

Sincerely, Michael Lee Dotson 102 Anderson St., Apt. B Carterville, IL 62918

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

There is no provision for protecting the lives of the First Responders.

Sincerely, Judy Cummings Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

This change is ludicrous and places the burden on the public. It is yet one more example of why trying to regulate something as hazardous as hydrofracking, particularly when the extraction of natural resources results in profits by a corporation, isn't going to work. This is a change from the regulations - not an oversight. The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

This change is ludicrous and places the burden on the public. It is yet one more example of why trying to regulate something as hazardous as hydrofracking, particularly when the extraction of natural resources results in profits by a corporation, isn't going to work. This is a change from the regulations - not an oversight. The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

This rule is obviously designed to subvert the intent of the law. You are creating unnecessary hoops that people have to jump through to try and discourage them from participating. It is apparent that "The fix is in".

Sincerely, Robert Yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

This rule is obviously designed to subvert the intent of the law. You are creating unnecessary hoops that people have to jump through to try and discourage them from participating. It is apparent that "The fix is in".

Sincerely, Robert Yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

To the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, My comment is in regards to defining what a "significant deviation" is. After looking through and digesting what the proposed rules and regulations lay out, it has come to my attention that there is a loophole created when something is vague and/or not properly defined. If and when defining something is left up to the company drilling, ultimately, it can become twisted and defined in multiple ways- with a different definition laid out by each fracking company. Section 1-55(c) of the Act addresses modifications by applicant and states, "If the Department determines that the proposed modifications constitute a significant deviation from the terms of the original application and permit approval, or presents a serious risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife, the Department shall provide the opportunities for notice, comment, and hearing required under Sections 1-45 and 1-50 of this Act." The drafted rules do state and define significant deviation to modifications that "(1) move the well, including the horizontal well bore, (2) Ad d new horizontal well bores, or (3) add length to any existing or planned horizontal well bores." However, there are many other circumstances in which the phrase "significant deviation" can apply! Personally, while I appreciate that the IDNR has taken the time to lay out (3) circumstances in which "significant deviation" does apply, I do not, in any way, shape, or form, understand why the IDNR has limited this so much. Yes, it may take time to list out all the circumstances, but by not doing that you are only leaving loopholes for companies who contort and define things to help benefit them the most in the end. Listing out different circumstances may not be the most effective use of time, but at least coming up with a tight definition would be. I have found the NRDC's way of defining a "significant deviation" to be quite appropriate and a very solid way of defining this phrase: "A permit modification shall be treated as a significant deviation from the original permit if the proposed actions or potential impacts of those actions may differ materially from those associated with the original permit application." Really, it is all in the language and way that something is worded. So if explicit examples are used when defining this term, those examples need to be framed nonexclusively to avoid any confusion, i.e., using such language as "including but not limited to...." It is in my opinion that this use of language/ wording will help avoid any confusion and will allow little room for definition manipulation by these fracking companies looking to increase profit. Please, please consider changing the language in this section of the drafted rules and regulations and consider making this a tighter section that avoids any type of a loophole as a whole. Thank you so much for your time in reading and considering this correction!

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell 3 Talisman Trace Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Who a potentially affected party must petiton in order to participate in a hearing Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.270 Public Hearings The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Who a potentially affected party must petiton in order to participate in a hearing Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.270 Public Hearings The Act's provision affording public hearings are critically important to ensuring that the public has the ability to fully understand hydraulic fracturing permits that may affect them, and challenge them if appropriate. We are therefore concerned that some aspects of the draft rules governing hearings could potentially undercut the robust public participation envisioned in the statute. Section 1-50(b) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act says any person having an interest that is or may be adversely affected [by a fracking permit], can petition the Department for participation in a hearing. But Subsection 245.270(a)(6) of the Rules raises the bar, requiring the request for hearing to be served upon the Hearing Officer, the Department, and the applicant. This is an inconsistency between the law and the rules. Problem: For a person advocating on his or her own behalf, this additional requirement adds an unnecessary burden that may discourage the robust public participation envisioned by the statue. Revisions Needed: Return to the requirements in the law requiring only a petition to the Department.

Sincerely, Sabrina Helen Bennett Hardenbergh 1 Hardenbergh Road Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart B: Registration and Permitting Procedures

Section 245.270 Public Hearings

Who would benefit from having the hearings away from the people most concerned in an area? The residents who know the local situation and are most touched by the decisions???? Or the company that would call on people not in touch with the real situation???? Why make it harder for the local residents to speak their mind and to bring local residents to speak? The use of web-base technology might help with this problem.

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

IDNR's Duties and Responsibilities to Protect the Citizens of Illinois How does this affect me: Health and well-being Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. Show

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

IDNR's Duties and Responsibilities to Protect the Citizens of Illinois How does this affect me: Health and well-being Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. Show

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

IDNR's Duties and Responsibilities to Protect the Citizens of Illinois How does this affect me: Health and well-being Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

IDNR's Duties and Responsibilities to Protect the Citizens of Illinois How does this affect me: Health and well-being Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

IDNR's Duties and Responsibilities to Protect the Citizens of Illinois How does this affect me: Health and well-being Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: 1.To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, 2.To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: " All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. " But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: " The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. " Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. "Will be conducted" is a mandate; "reasonably expected to be conducted" is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can "reasonably expect" that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: •224 violations of "Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. •143 violations of "Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. •140 violations of "Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation's intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Angel Lee 1103 E Lowden Ave Wheaton, IL 60189

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Bryan Cones Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The density of streams in Illinois make fracking impossible to do safely. I recommend that NO Fracking be allowed in Illinois. We need to protect our water resources for future generations. I believe it is time to move toward renewable resources and ban fracking in Illinois and the Great Lakes Region. Especially knowing that The Great Lakes account for 20% of the World's fresh water.

Sincerely, Carol Cummins, D.D.S. 3708 Ridge Pointe Drive Geneva, IL 60134

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The density of streams in Illinois make fracking impossible to do safely. I recommend that NO Fracking be allowed in Illinois. We need to protect our water resources for future generations. I believe it is time to move toward renewable resources and ban fracking in Illinois and the Great Lakes Region. Especially knowing that The Great Lakes account for 20% of the World's fresh water.

Sincerely, Carol Cummins, D.D.S. 3708 Ridge Pointe Drive Geneva, IL 60134

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. Personal comment: The fact that the regulations are weaker than the law is an extremely bad sign. It feels that we have already abdicated the state's duty to protect citizens, workers and the environment.

Sincerely, Christiane Rey 3651 N. Francisco Ave. Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, David Atwood Chicago, IL 60643

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment.This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute-- Section 1-75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances.The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment.This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute-- Section 1-75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances.The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment.This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute-- Section 1-75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances.The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kelly Taylor Mt. Vernon, IL 62864

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Patricia L. Dalke Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Patricia L. Dalke Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Tyler Hansen Oak Park, IL 60304

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Tyler Hansen Oak Park, IL 60304

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes.There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute:To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois,To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment.This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1-75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules:All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1- 53(a)(4) of the legislation states:The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not.If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as:224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste.143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth.140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances.The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes.There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute:To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois,To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment.This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1-75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules:All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1- 53(a)(4) of the legislation states:The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not.If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as:224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste.143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth.140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances.The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes.There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute:To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois,To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment.This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1-75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules:All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1- 53(a)(4) of the legislation states:The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not.If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as:224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste.143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth.140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances.The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife. But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner. IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: 224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste. 143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth. 140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances. The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.300 Permit Decision

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.300 Permit Decision In Section 1-130 of the regulatory statute, the legislature granted IDNR authority to adopt rules to carry out the legislature's purposes. There are at least two legislative purposes in the regulatory statute: 1.To allow horizontal fracking in Illinois, 2.To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment. This purpose is set forth explicitly in two places in the regulatory statute--Section 1- 75(a)(2) and Section 1-53(a)(4). IDNR has acknowledged 1-75 verbatim, in Section 245.800(2) of the proposed rules: “All phases of high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations shall be conducted in a manner that shall not pose a significant risk to public health, life, property, aquatic life, or wildlife.” But IDNR has changed the legislature's language in Section 1-53(a)(4) of the proposed rules, lowering the standard explicitly created by the legislature. Section 1-53(a)(4) of the legislation states: “The Department shall issue a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, with any conditions the Department may find necessary, only if the record of decision demonstrates that: the proposed hydraulic fracturing operations will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source. The key phrase there is "will be conducted". Clearly the intent of the statute is that fracking will only be allowed if it is conducted in a safe manner.” IDNR's proposed Section 245.300 changes the legislative words "will be conducted" to "as proposed, are reasonably expected to be conducted". This lowers the standard and is inconsistent with the legislature's stated purpose. “Will be conducted” is a mandate; “reasonably expected to be conducted” is not. If hydraulic fracturing outcomes in Illinois mirror effects of other states, we can “reasonably expect” that the industry will cut corners and violate standards. There have been over 3000 violations in PA since 2009 and they are not minor violations. They involve infractions such as: •224 violations of “Failure to properly store, transport, process or dispose of residual waste." •143 violations of “Discharge of pollutional material to the waters of Commonwealth." •140 violations of “Pit and tanks not constructed with sufficient capacity to contain pollutional substances." The residents of Illinois are depending on IDNR to protect their health, their safety, and the safety of their water, air, and soil. IDNR needs to return the legislation’s intent and mandate that hydraulic fracturing operations will only be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source.

Sincerely, M. Alan Wurth 2 Pioneer Lane Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

An attorney is needed at the public hearings because there is so much information to process for the general public to understand. To make it fair for the general public to challenge a permit an attorney is needed and should be paid for by the DNR - very expensive for general public.

Sincerely, Phil Gassman 1122 N 2803 Road Utica, IL 61373

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

An attorney is needed at the public hearings because there is so much information to process for the general public to understand. To make it fair for the general public to challenge a permit an attorney is needed and should be paid for by the DNR - very expensive for general public.

Sincerely, Phil Gassman 1122 N 2803 Road Utica, IL 61373

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

An attorney is needed at the public hearings because there is so much information to process for the general public to understand. To make it fair for the general public to challenge a permit an attorney is needed and should be paid for by the DNR - very expensive for general public.

Sincerely, Phil Gassman 1122 N 2803 Road Utica, IL 61373

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Janet Elizabeth Donoghue 5082 Springer Ridge Rd Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Maria H. Santaella 123 West Jackson Villa Park, IL 60181

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nancy Eichelberger 8405 S Ridge Rd Plainfield, IL 60544

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application. WAS THIS AN OVERSIGHT? WHAT WAS THE REASON BEHIND THIS CHANGE FROM THE ADOPTED REGULATIONS? THE RECOMMENDED REVISION IS FAIR AND SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN RULES THAT ARE REDRAFTED TO ADDRESS ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THIS COMMENT PERIOD.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Illinois law also limits compensation of experts needed in litigation to twenty bucks per diem for any deposition or testimony provided. Given the complexities of fracking, any plaintiff would be bankrupted paying qualified scientists to testify in litigation. I propose adding a clause to Section 245.345 that includes reimbursement of costs including and not limited to expert witness testimony fees, deposition fees and any other associated fees like copying expenses. The individual homeowners enter the legal arena against a very well funded corporation and the deck is stacked against the homeowner.

Sincerely, Paula Cade 213 Janet Lane Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Illinois law also limits compensation of experts needed in litigation to twenty bucks per diem for any deposition or testimony provided. Given the complexities of fracking, any plaintiff would be bankrupted paying qualified scientists to testify in litigation. I propose adding a clause to Section 245.345 that includes reimbursement of costs including and not limited to expert witness testimony fees, deposition fees and any other associated fees like copying expenses. The individual homeowners enter the legal arena against a very well funded corporation and the deck is stacked against the homeowner.

Sincerely, Paula Cade 213 Janet Lane Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Recouping Attorney Fees How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart C: Permit Decisions (245.300-245.360) 245.310 Permit Denial Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Recouping Attorney Fees How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart C: Permit Decisions (245.300-245.360) 245.310 Permit Denial Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Recouping Attorney Fees How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart C: Permit Decisions (245.300-245.360) 245.310 Permit Denial Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Recouping Attorney Fees How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart C: Permit Decisions (245.300-245.360)245.310 Permit Denial Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

Subpart C: Permit Decisions (245.300-245.360) 245.310 Permit Denial Comment: DNR's rules should include a provision that would authorize the recovery of attorney fees for those who successfully challenge a permit application. The Statutes: Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees where a person successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Also, section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." The Rules: But DNR's proposed rules do not allow for an award of attorney fees for an interested person who hires an attorney and successfully challenges a permit application. Given the typical situation--a vast disparity in financial resources between the typical industry applicant, on the one hand, and an adversely affected individual landowner or other interested person on the other, the ability to hire and pay for an attorney will be essential to ensuring a fair hearing on a contested permit application. Needed Revision: Section 245.310 should be revised to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to a person who successfully challenges a permit application.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

this is a piece of my mind...

Sincerely, dan lorenc here (there) springfield, IL 62701

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.310 Permit Denial

We all know the reality. An industry that makes $18 billion in profits has access to many more resources than the average individual who lives in central or southern Illinois. However, as the PennEnvironment report states, the public costs of hydraulic fracturing can be high, especially if not properly regulated. The oil and gas industry must not only pay for the damage that is done, but, if legal action is required to force them to comply with regulations or to recoup costs for environmental, health, or other kinds of costs, the plaintiffs--public, private, or otherwise--should not be saddled with the costs. http://www.pennenvironment.org/sites/environment/files/reports/The%20Costs%20of%20Fracking%20vPA_0.pdf The General Assembly, in its wisdom, understood that those who file and win litigation for harm caused via hydraulic fracturing should not be saddled with attorney's fees. Section 1-102(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (225 ILCS 752/1-102(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to an individual who successfully sues to enforce compliance with the Act: "(c) The court, in issuing any final order in any action brought under this Section, may award costs of litigation (including attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, on the basis of the importance of the proceeding and the participation of the parties to the efficient and effective enforcement of this Act." Section 10-55(c) of the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act (5 ILCS 100/10-55(c)) allows a circuit court to award attorney fees to a party who successfully challenges a DNR rule in court: "(c) In any case in which a party has any administrative rule invalidated by a court for any reason, including but not limited to the agency's exceeding its statutory authority or the agency's failure to follow statutory procedures in the adoption of the rule, the court shall award the party bringing the action the reasonable expenses of the litigation, including reasonable attorney's fees." However, IDNR's proposed rules do not permit the award of attorney fees to an individual or other entity that successfully challenges a permit application in court. This is a clear discrepancy between the Act and the Rules, which needs to be rectified. IDNR should revise Section 245.310 to include a provision for the reimbursement of attorney fees to an individual/organization that has successfully challenged a permit application in court.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Dear IDNR, Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source."But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. At a minimum these revisions are necessary, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met." Kurt

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

It is absurd to think that all potential impacts of a proposed modification to a permit would be the "subject" of a modification to a permit. For instance an aftershock is not the subject of an earthquake, but it is most certainly related to it and can be equally devastating. Because of the potential public and occupational risks of a fracking operation, permit applicants should be required to mention all potential impacts of modifications in the relevant sections of the application even if it is not the subject. This section should state that sections "that are not impacted by" the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

It is clear from the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act that IDNR is charged with protecting the health and safety of Illinois citizens and their environment. As noted in numerous other comments, the Act states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source" [Section 1-53(a)(4)]. While subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules diminishes the strength of the Act's statement, it is still clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." While I am not at all happy with the ambiguous language of subsection 245.300(c)(4), I'd like to address the implication in Subsection 245.330(d) that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without any additional modification whatsoever to eliminate the potential risk. It seems entirely incongruent with IDNR's responsibilities to Illinois citizens and their environment that any permit modification posing serious risk to Illinois constituents and their environment would be accepted without modification. In order to rectify this situation, the following language should be added to this subsection, at the bare minimum: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Effective Normal Stress and Induced Seismology If the effective normal stress, the frictional forces that hold a fault a place, is lowered, it can result in fault slippage and trigger earthquake nucleation. Increased fluid pressure relieves enough of squeeze on the fault to release it and induce an earthquake (Kerr, 2012). Injecting fluids that act as a pressurized cushion to relieve the effective normal stress that keeps a fault locked over-pressures a fault (Sheppard et al, 2013). Heather Savage, a geophysicist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, relates that, "When you over-pressure the fault, you reduce the stress that's pinning the fault into place and that's when earthquakes happen" (Earth Institute, 2013). Effective normal stress is equal to the difference between the applied normal stress and pore pressure (Ellsworth, 2013). Applied normal stress is the total stress on a rock (Hsieh, 1979), or the weight of a given block (Evans, 1966), and pore pressure is the pressure of fluid in the rock's pores and fractures (Ellsworth, 2013), such that increased pore pressure causes a decrease in frictional force, the effective normal stress (Warpinski, 2012).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Fluid Pressure: Inducing Seismology By Exceeding Critical Value The discovery by David Evans published in his 1966 Geotimes study, which led to speculations that earthquakes might be controllable, was that the subterranean highpressure injection of fluid was responsible for the triggering of earthquakes at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, Colorado in the early to mid 1960s. While earthquakes were being induced by the injection of pressurized wastewater into stressed rock formations, the reduction in fluid pressure caused a sharp decrease in frequency of seismic activity (Raleigh et al., 1976). A 1972 Tectonophysics study by Healy and others entitled “Prospects for earthquake prediction and control” more explicitly expressed this understanding and laid further groundwork for experimentally testing this hypothesis that, “Changes in fluid pressure may control timing of seismic activity and make it possible to control natural earthquakes by controlling variations in fluid pressure in fault zones” (Healy, et al., 1972). Raleigh, Healy and Bredehoeft’s landmark 1976 Science study “An Experiment in Earthquake Control at Rangely, Colorado” did demonstrate the capacity to turn on and turn off earthquakes and “established the correlation between fluid pressure and earthquakes beyond reasonable doubt,” that they concluded the “control of the San Andreas fault could ultimately prove to be feasible.” However, despite these earth-shattering revelations, perhaps the most important takeaway from these experiments was that, “successful prediction of the approximate pore pressure required for triggering of earthquakes according to the Hubbert-Rubey theory was possible” (Raleigh et al., 1976), as demonstrated by experimental verification of theoretical projections.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Fracking Wastewater in Deep-Injection Disposal Wells As there has been a monumental increase in total fracking-related wastewater produced over the last decade, there has likewise been a dramatic increase in total fracking wastewater injected into disposal wells, where 95% of the toxic effluent is managed. Of the more than 680,000 total injection wells in the United States, in excess of 150,000 fall into the energy industry-specific Class II category that includes both deep-disposal wells in addition to “wells in which fluids are injected to force out trapped oil and gas” (Lustgarten, 2012a). Approximately 30,000 to 40,000 of these Class II wells are deepdisposal wells that receive the volumes of fracking flowback and produced wastewater (Diep, 2013; Ellsworth, 2013; Soraghan, 2013). The states with the most Class II injection wells are Texas (52,016), California (29,505), Kansas (16,658), Oklahoma (10,629), and Illinois (7,843) (US EPA, 2010). A study by the Argonne National Laboratory estimated that a total of 252 billion gallons of fracking wastewater is injected into Class II deep disposal wells in the United States per year (Clark and Veil, 2009; Clarke et al., 2012). In Texas the total amount of fracking wastewater being injected into deep disposal wells went from 46 million barrels (1.45 billion gallons) in 2005 to nearly 3.5 billion barrels (110.25 billion gallons) in 2011, representing a 76-fold increase in total fracking wastewater injection volume in a six-year period (Galbraith and Henry, 2013). The total amount injected into the more than 150,000 total Class II wells among 33 states is at least 10 trillion gallons of wastewater (Lustgarten, 2012c), while over the last several decades all U.S. industries combined have injected in excess of 30 trillion gallons of toxic liquid into all classes of injection wells, “using broad expanses of the nation's geology as an invisible dumping ground” (Lustgarten, 2012a).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Historic Shift in Frequency of Midcontinent Earthquakes Seismologists like the U.S. Geological Survey's William Ellsworth started noticing a historically unique trend about a dozen years ago, "that there were an unusual number of earthquakes in the middle of the country," in areas that have not been known for earthquakes (Rugh, 2013). The Guy-Greenbrier area of Arkansas, with total population of just over 5,000, was traditionally a quake-free area. Throughout all of 2007 the area had only one earthquake of magnitude 2.5 or greater, followed by only two such quakes in 2008. However, in 2009 there were 10, and in 2010 there were 54 earthquakes of magnitude 2.5 or greater (Kerr, 2012). On February 27, 2011, Guy experienced a magnitude 4.7 earthquake. Neighboring state Oklahoma went through a similar pattern as a whole, experiencing just a few earthquakes per year from 1972 to 2007, 12 in 2008, 50 in 2009, and more than 1,000 in 2010, culminating with a magnitude 5.7 earthquake on November 6, 2011. While Oklahoma saw a more than hundred-fold increase in overall earthquakes, it also saw a twenty-fold increase in earthquakes with magnitude 3.0 or greater in those same three years from 2008 to 2010 (Ellsworth et al, 2012). Meanwhile, the Barnett Shale region of north central Texas has experienced "unprecedented levels of seismicity" since shale gas de¬velopment began in late 1998, with "nine earthquakes of magnitude 3.0 or larger occurred, compared with none in the preceding 25 years." Overall, the states reporting unusually elevated levels of seismic activity include Arkansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma Texas, and Virginia (Ellsworth, 2013). This pattern seen in both localized and statewide contexts is also reflected in data concerning the frequency of magnitude 3.0 or greater earthquakes in the entire U.S. midcontinent region, with the annual number of magnitude 3.0 or greater earthquakes having "in¬creased almost tenfold in the past decade" (Lovett, 2013). The "middle part of the continent" went from a remarkably consistent av¬erage 21 per year from 1970 to 2000, to an average of 29 per year from 2001 to 2008, to 50 magnitude 3.0 or greater quakes in 2009, to 87 in 2010, to somewhere in the range of 134 to 188 in 2011 (Demus, 2012; Ellsworth, 2013; Henry, 2012; Lovett, 2013). As William Ellsworth et al (2012) reported in their Seismological Research Letters study, "A naturally-occurring rate change of this magnitude is unprecedented outside of volcanic settings or in the absence of a main shock, of which there were neither in this region" (Ellsworth et al, 2012). Especially in areas that have historically lacked earthquakes, like the Youngstown, Ohio area, as Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory seismologist John Armbruster relates, "Having that many earthquakes […] where there aren't a lot of earthquakes, was suspicious" (Fountain, 2012). What all these different scenarios share is a common time frame for the onset of fracking industrialization, and an ever-expanding need for deep-injection disposal wells [DIDWs] to handle the massive volumes of associated fracking flowback and produced wastewater. A 2013 Science study (van der Elst et al, 2013) by a team of seismologists led by Nicholas van der Elst of Columbia Uni¬versity's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory found, "that at least half of the magnitude-4.5 or larger earthquakes that have struck the inte¬rior United States in the past decade have occurred near injec¬tion-well sites" (Lovett, 2013). A 2013 Geology study (Keranen et al., 2013) by a team of seismologists led by Katie

Keranen concluded while earthquakes with magnitude 5.0 or greater are a rarity east of the Rocky Mountains, “the number per year recorded in the midcon¬tinent increased 11-fold between 2008 and 2011, compared to 1976–2007” (Keranen, 2013). When interviewed concerning col¬league response to the study, Keranen indicated that, “Pretty much everybody who looks at our data accepts that these events were likely caused by injection” (Behar, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Migrating Fluid and Precambrian Crystalline Basements An essential practical conclusion from the Groundwater study (Zhang et al, 2013) is the factor that has the single largest impact in preventing seismic induction within the underlying crystalline basement is the presence of a confining unit barrier between the sedimentary reservoir and the lower Precambrian layer. William Ellsworth describes those injection wells that "dispose of very large volumes of water and/or communicate pressure perturbations directly into basement faults" (Ellsworth, 2013) as problematic disposal wells. Geophysicist Barry Raleigh, whose 1976 Science study "An experiment in earthquake control at Rangely, Colorado" demonstrated how earthquakes could be turned on and off by utilizing manipulation of fluid pressure, elucidates that the deep, low-permeability, brittle igneous and metamorphic rock of the crystalline basement "doesn't have a lot of capacity for taking any of these fluids. As a storage medium, they're pretty crappy" (Kerr, 2012). Readily felt earthquakes larger than magnitude 4.0 that have been induced by injection of fracking wastewater into deep disposal wells additionally point to a deeper subterranean origin to these larger earthquakes. "Burdened by far more overlying rock, the deep rock is already carrying stress that," when combined with "the added pressure of the injection trigger," manifests conditions ripe for fault rupture and potentially destructive seismic activity (Kerr, 2012). Zhang et al. (2013) hypothesize that "elevated pore pressures could propagate downward along distributed fracture networks or along conductive fault zones in Precambrian crystalline rocks" (Zhang et al, 2013), meaning that the pressure from fluids can be potentially transmitted to hidden fractures at great depths, given the right conditions. In fact, David M. Evans, in his seminal 1966 Geotimes study, relates that even "if the Precambrian fracture system extends to a depth of 12 miles, then fluid pressure could [still] be transmitted to that depth by moderate surface injection pressure as long as the fracture system is open for transmission of that pressure" (Evans, 1966).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Pore Pressure and Induced Seismology Finally, elevating the pore pressure of the fluid in the rock can readily lead to seismic events given the proper conditions, like a stressed fault in contact with pressurized, migrating liquid. As the measure of the pressure of the fluid in the rock's pores and fractures, pore pressure is equal to the difference between applied normal stress and effective normal stress (Ellsworth, 2013). Thus as pore pressure increases, the effective normal stress will decrease. This effective normal stress can also be understood as the frictional resistance against the shearing stress along the fracture plane (Hsieh, 1979). If there is a sufficient enough increase in fluid pressure such that the shearing stress overcomes frictional resistance, the fault will slip and result in an earthquake. This is known as the Hubbert-Rubey mechanism, named after the findings in their seminal 1959 Geological Society of America Bulletin study "Role of fluid pressure in mechanics of overthrust faulting," as elucidated by Paul Hsieh: "The original work of Hubbert and Rubey (1959) actually concerns the role of pore pressure in the mechanics of overthrust faulting. They introduced the concept of rock movements caused by a Mohr-Coulomb-type failure in a fluid-filled rock environment. This concept was first cited by Evans (1966) in his paper on injection–earthquake relationship and subsequently gained wide acceptance as the mechanism through which injection has caused the earthquakes." (Hsieh, 1979) In his "A review of theories of mechanisms of induced seismicity" that was published in Engineering Geology, Kisslinger relates that fluid injection induced earthquakes "are adequately explained" by a combination of the concept of effective pressure in a waterfilled porous mechanism and the Coulomb-Mohr failure criterion, which embodies the three factors and their interrelationship that determines whether or not a particular fracking wastewater injection well will induce earthquakes (Kisslinger, 1976). Kisslinger further concludes that reservoir-related earthquakes, like those caused by fluid injection in bore holes, are induced by the same mechanisms, but in light of the lower injection pressures, "additional physical or chemical effects of the water on the materials may play an important role, [such as] a weakening of the materials in old fault zones by the introduction of water or static fatigue in silicate rocks due to stress corrosion (Kisslinger, 1976).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Predicting Earthquake Behavior, Controlling Earthquakes By Manipulating Fluid Pressure Utilizing the Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion in applying the Hubbert-Rubey theory, Raleigh and colleagues projected that 257 bars (25.7 MPa) would be the Rangely site's critical fluid pressure. The critical fluid pressure, the pressure required to trigger an earthquake, is governed by the equation: †crit = μ(Sn – Pc), with †crit = shear stress at failure point, μ = coefficient of static friction of the rocks, Sn = effective normal stress, and Pc = critical fluid pressure that induces seismicity. "The fluid pressure required to trigger earthquakes on preexisting fractures" was experimentally tested against the theoretical projections through use of "laboratory measurements of the fric-tional properties of the reservoir rocks and an in situ stress meas-urement made near the earthquake zone" (Raleigh et al., 1976). Experimental results, which were obtained by varying fluid pressure through the process of "alternately injecting and recovering water from wells that penetrated the seismic zone" (Raleigh et al., 1976), demonstrated that when the injection wells were subjected to fluid pressures above 257 bars the earthquake frequency increased, and when the fluid pressure was less than 257 bars the earthquakes subsided. The idea is that for any given injection well and pre-existing fault situation a critical fluid pressure can be determined, such that "we may ultimately be able to control the timing and the size of major earthquakes […] wherever we can control the fluid pressure in a fault zone" in relation to that critical fluid pressure (Raleigh et al., 1976). Hsieh and Bredehoeft (1981), in an expansion of Hsieh's 1979 master's thesis (Hsieh, 1979), analyzed the Rocky Mountain Arsenal injection wells and earthquakes in similar fashion, utilizing Hubbert-Rubey theory to identify the fluid pressure critical value, "the pressure build-up above which earthquakes occur" (Hsieh, 1979). Their conclusion was that, "At the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, earthquakes occurred within the crystalline basement when the fluid pressures were raised over 320 m above hydrostatic conditions [32 bars, 3.2 MPa] between a depth of about 0.7–7 km (Hsieh and Bredehoeft, 1981; Zhang et al, 2013). Another way to frame this is that the earthquakes were confined strictly to those parts of the reservoir where the pressure build-up exceeded 32 bars (Hsieh, 1979). According to Davis and Frohlich (1993), Hsieh and Bredehoeft's breakthrough was that they were "able to explain the spatial and temporal extent of seismic activity in Denver in terms of the flow of fluids along a permeable semi-infinite rectangular region which approximately contained the activity."

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Predicting Earthquake Behavior, Controlling Earthquakes By Manipulating Fluid Pressure Utilizing the Mohr-Coulomb failure criterion in applying the Hubbert-Rubey theory, Raleigh and colleagues projected that 257 bars (25.7 MPa) would be the Rangely site's critical fluid pressure. The critical fluid pressure, the pressure required to trigger an earthquake, is governed by the equation: †crit = μ(Sn – Pc), with †crit = shear stress at failure point, μ = coefficient of static friction of the rocks, Sn = effective normal stress, and Pc = critical fluid pressure that induces seismicity. "The fluid pressure required to trigger earthquakes on preexisting fractures" was experimentally tested against the theoretical projections through use of "laboratory measurements of the fric-tional properties of the reservoir rocks and an in situ stress meas-urement made near the earthquake zone" (Raleigh et al., 1976). Experimental results, which were obtained by varying fluid pressure through the process of "alternately injecting and recovering water from wells that penetrated the seismic zone" (Raleigh et al., 1976), demonstrated that when the injection wells were subjected to fluid pressures above 257 bars the earthquake frequency increased, and when the fluid pressure was less than 257 bars the earthquakes subsided. The idea is that for any given injection well and pre-existing fault situation a critical fluid pressure can be determined, such that "we may ultimately be able to control the timing and the size of major earthquakes […] wherever we can control the fluid pressure in a fault zone" in relation to that critical fluid pressure (Raleigh et al., 1976). Hsieh and Bredehoeft (1981), in an expansion of Hsieh's 1979 master's thesis (Hsieh, 1979), analyzed the Rocky Mountain Arsenal injection wells and earthquakes in similar fashion, utilizing Hubbert-Rubey theory to identify the fluid pressure critical value, "the pressure build-up above which earthquakes occur" (Hsieh, 1979). Their conclusion was that, "At the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver, earthquakes occurred within the crystalline basement when the fluid pressures were raised over 320 m above hydrostatic conditions [32 bars, 3.2 MPa] between a depth of about 0.7–7 km (Hsieh and Bredehoeft, 1981; Zhang et al, 2013). Another way to frame this is that the earthquakes were confined strictly to those parts of the reservoir where the pressure build-up exceeded 32 bars (Hsieh, 1979). According to Davis and Frohlich (1993), Hsieh and Bredehoeft's breakthrough was that they were "able to explain the spatial and temporal extent of seismic activity in Denver in terms of the flow of fluids along a permeable semi-infinite rectangular region which approximately contained the activity."

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Proliferation of Shale Gas & Oil Extraction and Fracking Wells Over the last decade the United States has seen an unprecedented increase in the proliferation of shale gas and oil extraction that has pushed domestic oil to its current place of highest level of production in 20 years, while bringing natural gas production to an all-time high (Weber, 2013). Shale gas from fracking specifically has gone from only 2% of U.S. natural gas production in 2000 to 23% of NG production in 2010 (US EIA, 2012). Because of fracking, the International Energy Agency projects that the U.S. will overtake Russia as the world's top producer of natural gas by 2015. With this precipitous increase in shale oil and gas production, the U.S. has likewise seen an increase in the proliferation of fracking wells, with more than 82,000 drilled or permitted in 17 states between 2005 and 2012. At the time of this writing (November of 2013) there are likely in excess of 100,000 fracking wells permitted or drilled in the U.S. (Ellsworth, 2013). In 2012 alone there were 22,326 fracking wells drilled throughout the United States, with more than 60% of them (13,540) being drilled in Texas (Ridlington & Rumpler, 2013). During that year drilling inspectors identified more than 55,000 violations of Texas fracking laws by oil and gas companies (Soraghan, 2013a).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Rate of Fluid Injection and the Work of Cliff Frohlich A third surface-controlled parameter that can impact fracking wastewater disposal induced seismicity is that of rate of fluid injection. While the rate of fluid injection and withdrawal played role in the Rangely, Colorado earthquake control experiments (Healy, et al., 1972), few scientists outside of Cliff Frohlich are investigating what he has observed to be a relationship between high rates of fluid injection and induced seismicity. From varies studies of the Barnett Shale play in Texas, Frohlich has found that injection wells nearest induced earthquake groups consistently reported maximum monthly injection rates in excess of 6.34 million gallons (24,000 cubic meters) of fluid, “and generally these injection rates had been maintained for a year or more prior to the onset of earthquake activity” (Frohlich, 2012). While Frohlich has indicated in interviews that he is very much interested in pursuing this line of inquiry in other fracking wastewater injection regions (Choi, 2012), his own studies have already indicated that other faulted areas demonstrate different maximum monthly injection rates required to induce earthquakes, such as a fluid injection rate of 9.5 to 12.7 million gallons (32,000 to 48,000 cubic meters) per month in the case of Paradox Valley, Colorado (Frohlich et al, 2010). While there is still a lot of research and experimentation required to clarify the precise role of the three surface parameters of fluid pressure, total fluid volume, and rate of fluid injection in triggering earthquakes, William Ellsworth concurs that experimental results distinctly suggest that these factors all “may be a predictor of seismic potential” (Ellsworth, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Rate of Fluid Injection and the Work of Cliff Frohlich A third surface-controlled parameter that can impact fracking wastewater disposal induced seismicity is that of rate of fluid injection. While the rate of fluid injection and withdrawal played role in the Rangely, Colorado earthquake control experiments (Healy, et al., 1972), few scientists outside of Cliff Frohlich are investigating what he has observed to be a relationship between high rates of fluid injection and induced seismicity. From varies studies of the Barnett Shale play in Texas, Frohlich has found that injection wells nearest induced earthquake groups consistently reported maximum monthly injection rates in excess of 6.34 million gallons (24,000 cubic meters) of fluid, “and generally these injection rates had been maintained for a year or more prior to the onset of earthquake activity” (Frohlich, 2012). While Frohlich has indicated in interviews that he is very much interested in pursuing this line of inquiry in other fracking wastewater injection regions (Choi, 2012), his own studies have already indicated that other faulted areas demonstrate different maximum monthly injection rates required to induce earthquakes, such as a fluid injection rate of 9.5 to 12.7 million gallons (32,000 to 48,000 cubic meters) per month in the case of Paradox Valley, Colorado (Frohlich et al, 2010). While there is still a lot of research and experimentation required to clarify the precise role of the three surface parameters of fluid pressure, total fluid volume, and rate of fluid injection in triggering earthquakes, William Ellsworth concurs that experimental results distinctly suggest that these factors all “may be a predictor of seismic potential” (Ellsworth, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Rate of Fluid Injection and the Work of Cliff Frohlich A third surface-controlled parameter that can impact fracking wastewater disposal induced seismicity is that of rate of fluid injection. While the rate of fluid injection and withdrawal played role in the Rangely, Colorado earthquake control experiments (Healy, et al., 1972), few scientists outside of Cliff Frohlich are investigating what he has observed to be a relationship between high rates of fluid injection and induced seismicity. From varies studies of the Barnett Shale play in Texas, Frohlich has found that injection wells nearest induced earthquake groups consistently reported maximum monthly injection rates in excess of 6.34 million gallons (24,000 cubic meters) of fluid, “and generally these injection rates had been maintained for a year or more prior to the onset of earthquake activity” (Frohlich, 2012). While Frohlich has indicated in interviews that he is very much interested in pursuing this line of inquiry in other fracking wastewater injection regions (Choi, 2012), his own studies have already indicated that other faulted areas demonstrate different maximum monthly injection rates required to induce earthquakes, such as a fluid injection rate of 9.5 to 12.7 million gallons (32,000 to 48,000 cubic meters) per month in the case of Paradox Valley, Colorado (Frohlich et al, 2010). While there is still a lot of research and experimentation required to clarify the precise role of the three surface parameters of fluid pressure, total fluid volume, and rate of fluid injection in triggering earthquakes, William Ellsworth concurs that experimental results distinctly suggest that these factors all “may be a predictor of seismic potential” (Ellsworth, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Shutting Down of Wells that Induced Earthquakes Geologists and seismologists are not the only engaged professionals raising concerns about fracking wastewater disposal related induced seismology. State oil and gas officials in both Arkansas and Ohio have shut down fracking wastewater disposal wells that have been connected with induced earthquakes. In the case of induced seismology in the Guy- Greenbrier area or Arkansas, the state's governor, Oil and Gas commission, and the general public all concurred to shut down the responsible injection-wells as, "nearly 1000 recorded quakes had struck the area since the wells had started up" (Kerr, 2012). A moratorium was declared within a 1,150 square mile area around Guy-Greenbrier on deepinjection wastewater disposal activities, while seismic-risk studies of the entire Fayetteville shale play were also required. Additionally, "Affected residents filed a class-action lawsuit against Chesapeake Energy and BHP Billiton Petroleum—the first time anyone has sued oil and gas companies for causing an earthquake" (Behar, 2013). University of Memphis seismologist Stephen Horton related that once the wells were shut down the quakes tapered away and ultimately ceased (Kerr, 2012).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Long Understood Relationship Between Subterranean Fluid Disposal & Induced Seismology Some may point to 77 CE Rome for the origins of the human demonstration of the relationship between elevated fluid pressure and induced geological failure, a welldocumented case in which Romans utilized the technique to "undermine and instantly remove vast quantities of mountainside to extract gold from the buried mother lode at Las Médulas in northwest Spain" (Goodway, 2012). Others might claim that we have shared this understanding for almost a century, such as members of the Committee on Induced Seismicity Potential in Energy Technologies, who claim that "induced seismic activity has been documented since at least the 1920s" (Clarke et al., 2012), referencing a 1926 study that ran in the Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America regarding "Local subsidence of the Goose Creek oil field (Texas)" (Pratt and Johnson, 1926). While these obscure examples add clarity to this generally familiar yet elusive phenomenon, it is David M. Evans' 1966 Geotimes study "Man-made earthquakes in Denver" that is popularly credited with establishing the connection between injection of waste fluids and induced earthquakes (Choi, 2012; Ellsworth, 2013; Frohlich, 2012; Henry, 2012; Kerr, 2012; Soraghan, 2013), such that "since 1966, scientists have generally agreed that injection may induce earthquakes in tectonically favorable situations" (Davis and Frohlich, 1993). Keep in mind that Plate Tectonic Theory did not come into general acceptance until just one-year prior, in 1965, to the verification of this form of human induced earthquake phenomena.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Long Understood Relationship Between Subterranean Fluid Disposal & Induced Seismology Some may point to 77 CE Rome for the origins of the human demonstration of the relationship between elevated fluid pressure and induced geological failure, a welldocumented case in which Romans utilized the technique to "undermine and instantly remove vast quantities of mountainside to extract gold from the buried mother lode at Las Médulas in northwest Spain" (Goodway, 2012). Others might claim that we have shared this understanding for almost a century, such as members of the Committee on Induced Seismicity Potential in Energy Technologies, who claim that "induced seismic activity has been documented since at least the 1920s" (Clarke et al., 2012), referencing a 1926 study that ran in the Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America regarding "Local subsidence of the Goose Creek oil field (Texas)" (Pratt and Johnson, 1926). While these obscure examples add clarity to this generally familiar yet elusive phenomenon, it is David M. Evans' 1966 Geotimes study "Man-made earthquakes in Denver" that is popularly credited with establishing the connection between injection of waste fluids and induced earthquakes (Choi, 2012; Ellsworth, 2013; Frohlich, 2012; Henry, 2012; Kerr, 2012; Soraghan, 2013), such that "since 1966, scientists have generally agreed that injection may induce earthquakes in tectonically favorable situations" (Davis and Frohlich, 1993). Keep in mind that Plate Tectonic Theory did not come into general acceptance until just one-year prior, in 1965, to the verification of this form of human induced earthquake phenomena.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Long Understood Relationship Between Subterranean Fluid Disposal & Induced Seismology Some may point to 77 CE Rome for the origins of the human demonstration of the relationship between elevated fluid pressure and induced geological failure, a welldocumented case in which Romans utilized the technique to "undermine and instantly remove vast quantities of mountainside to extract gold from the buried mother lode at Las Médulas in northwest Spain" (Goodway, 2012). Others might claim that we have shared this understanding for almost a century, such as members of the Committee on Induced Seismicity Potential in Energy Technologies, who claim that "induced seismic activity has been documented since at least the 1920s" (Clarke et al., 2012), referencing a 1926 study that ran in the Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America regarding "Local subsidence of the Goose Creek oil field (Texas)" (Pratt and Johnson, 1926). While these obscure examples add clarity to this generally familiar yet elusive phenomenon, it is David M. Evans' 1966 Geotimes study "Man-made earthquakes in Denver" that is popularly credited with establishing the connection between injection of waste fluids and induced earthquakes (Choi, 2012; Ellsworth, 2013; Frohlich, 2012; Henry, 2012; Kerr, 2012; Soraghan, 2013), such that "since 1966, scientists have generally agreed that injection may induce earthquakes in tectonically favorable situations" (Davis and Frohlich, 1993). Keep in mind that Plate Tectonic Theory did not come into general acceptance until just one-year prior, in 1965, to the verification of this form of human induced earthquake phenomena.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Mechanisms Underlying Earthquakes Induced by Fracking Wastewater DIDWs In regards to the fracking wastewater disposal-induced earthquakes that have been escalating in frequency in the United States' midcontinent over the last decade, U.S. Geological Survey's William Ellsworth concludes that the mechanism responsible for inducing this seismic activity is the "well-understood process of weakening a preexisting fault by elevating the fluid pressure" (Ellsworth, 2013). Ellsworth clarifies that the three specific events that can trigger the nucleation of an earthquake by bringing the fault to failure are, 1) reducing the effective normal stress on a locked fault, 2) increasing the shear stress along a fracture plane, and 3) elevating the pore pressure of the fluid in the rock. Nucleation is the process that marks the beginning of an earthquake with an initial rupture that propagates along the fault surface. Fault failure or slippage can trigger this process, and in turn, generate an earthquake (Ellsworth, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Mechanisms Underlying Earthquakes Induced by Fracking Wastewater DIDWs In regards to the fracking wastewater disposal-induced earthquakes that have been escalating in frequency in the United States' midcontinent over the last decade, U.S. Geological Survey's William Ellsworth concludes that the mechanism responsible for inducing this seismic activity is the "well-understood process of weakening a preexisting fault by elevating the fluid pressure" (Ellsworth, 2013). Ellsworth clarifies that the three specific events that can trigger the nucleation of an earthquake by bringing the fault to failure are, 1) reducing the effective normal stress on a locked fault, 2) increasing the shear stress along a fracture plane, and 3) elevating the pore pressure of the fluid in the rock. Nucleation is the process that marks the beginning of an earthquake with an initial rupture that propagates along the fault surface. Fault failure or slippage can trigger this process, and in turn, generate an earthquake (Ellsworth, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Mechanisms Underlying Earthquakes Induced by Fracking Wastewater DIDWs In regards to the fracking wastewater disposal-induced earthquakes that have been escalating in frequency in the United States' midcontinent over the last decade, U.S. Geological Survey's William Ellsworth concludes that the mechanism responsible for inducing this seismic activity is the "well-understood process of weakening a preexisting fault by elevating the fluid pressure" (Ellsworth, 2013). Ellsworth clarifies that the three specific events that can trigger the nucleation of an earthquake by bringing the fault to failure are, 1) reducing the effective normal stress on a locked fault, 2) increasing the shear stress along a fracture plane, and 3) elevating the pore pressure of the fluid in the rock. Nucleation is the process that marks the beginning of an earthquake with an initial rupture that propagates along the fault surface. Fault failure or slippage can trigger this process, and in turn, generate an earthquake (Ellsworth, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Mechanisms Underlying Earthquakes Induced by Fracking Wastewater DIDWs In regards to the fracking wastewater disposal-induced earthquakes that have been escalating in frequency in the United States' midcontinent over the last decade, U.S. Geological Survey's William Ellsworth concludes that the mechanism responsible for inducing this seismic activity is the "well-understood process of weakening a preexisting fault by elevating the fluid pressure" (Ellsworth, 2013). Ellsworth clarifies that the three specific events that can trigger the nucleation of an earthquake by bringing the fault to failure are, 1) reducing the effective normal stress on a locked fault, 2) increasing the shear stress along a fracture plane, and 3) elevating the pore pressure of the fluid in the rock. Nucleation is the process that marks the beginning of an earthquake with an initial rupture that propagates along the fault surface. Fault failure or slippage can trigger this process, and in turn, generate an earthquake (Ellsworth, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) The Youngstown, Ohio Fracking Wastewater Disposal Induced Earthquakes When a magnitude 2.7 earthquake struck near Youngstown, Ohio on December 24, 2011, it was the tenth such earthquake in the 2.0 to 2.7 magnitude range since March of that year connected with fracking wastewater injection well Northstar 1 owned by D&L Energy Group. The well, which came online in December 2010 (just three months prior to start of seismic activity), received the vast majority of its wastewater from fracking projects in Pennsylvania (Fountain, 2012). Nearly 60% of all the fracking wastewater disposed of in Ohio injection-wells in 2012, 257 million gallons, originated in others states, marking a 19% one-year increase in out-of-state fracking wastewater injected into subterranean Ohio (Johanek, 2013). Prior to January 2011 Youngstown, Ohio had not experienced an earthquake dating back to 1776 when scientists first began recording their observations (Choi, 2013). Upon analysis of the December 24, 2011 earthquake by the Ohio Department of Natural Resources it was determined that the quake originated less than 2,000 feet below the Northstar 1 well (Fountain, 2012). No sooner had the State of Ohio put an immediate cessation to injection at the well, when an earthquake with a 16 times greater magnitude of 3.9 struck the following week, on New Year's Eve, December 31, 2011. At that point state officials instituted a moratorium on the injection of fracking wastewater within a 5-mile radius of the D&L well until scientists had an opportunity to analyze the data from the string of quakes (Fountain, 2012). By the time March 2012 rolled around, Youngstown, Ohio had recorded 109 earthquakes in the previous year (Choi, 2013), and "the indications were strong enough to prompt the state to order the shutdown of four injection wells in the area and issue strong new regulations" (Kerr, 2012). On July 12, 2012 Executive Order (2012-09K) was signed by Ohio Governor John Kasich, which required that operators conduct seismic studies prior to issuance of well permits (Kasich, 2012). Ohio now stands alone in requiring a seismic-risk assessment for all of its injection wells, as every other state, and the federal government, have yet to do (Behar, 2013). Seismologist John Armbruster puts points out that within a year of the Northstar 1 well opening there were 109 total earthquakes, and "twelve felt earthquakes. After the well was shut down, the number decreased dramatically. You'd need Powerball odds for that to be a coincidence" (Behar, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Total Injected Fluid Volume and Maximum Earthquake Magnitude The relationship between total fluid volume injected and induced seismology has been noted by many, whether it is the “qualitative correlation between earthquake rates and the injected volume” that has served as a tool for investigating the triggered earthquake phenomena (Oprsal and Eisner, 2013), or the case history-driven evidence suggesting a connection between the total volume of injected wastewater and the maximum induced earthquake magnitude (Hayes, 2012). The U.S. Geological Survey’s Art McGarr has compiled the data from these case histories and reports from fracking, waste disposal and geothermal induced seismic events, and has graphed Total Injected Volume vs. Maximum Earthquake Magnitude for 17 different cases of demonstrated fluid disposal triggered earthquakes (Holland and Keller, 2012; Verdon, 2013a; Verdon, 2013b): Total Gal. Magnitude Injected Richter (thousands) Scale Location . 53 1.4 Bavaria Germany (KTB) 1,057 2.3 Blackpool, England (BUK) 2,325 2.8 Garvin County, Oklahoma (GAR) 3,170 3.4 Basel, Switzerland (BAS) 9,774 3.7 geothermal at CBN 10,567 2.9 Soultz, France (STZ) 15,850 3.6 Ashtabula, OH (ASH) 21,134 3.9 Youngstown, Ohio (YOH) 89,818 3.8 Ashtabula, OH (ASH) 103,026 4.4 Raton Basin, Colorado (RAT) 158,502 4.6 Guy, Arkansas (GAK) 158,502 4.7 Rocky Mountain Arsenal (RMA) 766,093 5.0 Raton Basin, Colorado (RAT) 845,344 4.3 Paradox Basin, Colorado (PBN) 1,320,850 5.3 Raton Basin, Colorado (RAT) 3,170,040 5.7 Prague, Oklahoma (POK) While “McGarr found a relationship between the maximum magnitude of induced earthquakes and the total volume of fluid injected into a site” (Balcerak, 2013), James Verdon reminds us that the McGarr model “is only empirical, there is no real physics behind it” (Verdon, 2013a). McGarr’s model does, however, create an interesting framework for further theoretical and experimental work, while also leading to the derivation of the McGarr equation for injection-induced seismicity: M0(max) = G?v, with M0(max) = magnitude of largest seismic moment, G = shear modulus of rock (ratio of shear stress to shear strain), and ?v = total volume of fluid injected. Despite potential shortcomings, Verdon does admit that, “In the meantime, we are left with the empirical McGarr equation as our main guide” (Verdon, 2013a). He also makes certain to clarify: “It should of course be remembered that the McGarr equation does not tell you the maximum magnitude you will get in an operation. […] The McGarr line tells you the maximum magnitude you could get if you are very unlucky” (Verdon, 2013a). While McGarr continues to clarify the undeniable connection between the total injected fluid volume and the potential maximum magnitude of induced earthquakes, he does not find the rate of fluid injection to impact the magnitude of triggered earthquakes, but rather he found “that the rate of injection of fluid influences the frequency of induced earthquakes” (Balcerak, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Total Injected Fluid Volume and Maximum Earthquake Magnitude The relationship between total fluid volume injected and induced seismology has been noted by many, whether it is the “qualitative correlation between earthquake rates and the injected volume” that has served as a tool for investigating the triggered earthquake phenomena (Oprsal and Eisner, 2013), or the case history-driven evidence suggesting a connection between the total volume of injected wastewater and the maximum induced earthquake magnitude (Hayes, 2012). The U.S. Geological Survey’s Art McGarr has compiled the data from these case histories and reports from fracking, waste disposal and geothermal induced seismic events, and has graphed Total Injected Volume vs. Maximum Earthquake Magnitude for 17 different cases of demonstrated fluid disposal triggered earthquakes (Holland and Keller, 2012; Verdon, 2013a; Verdon, 2013b): Total Gal. Magnitude Injected Richter (thousands) Scale Location . 53 1.4 Bavaria Germany (KTB) 1,057 2.3 Blackpool, England (BUK) 2,325 2.8 Garvin County, Oklahoma (GAR) 3,170 3.4 Basel, Switzerland (BAS) 9,774 3.7 geothermal at CBN 10,567 2.9 Soultz, France (STZ) 15,850 3.6 Ashtabula, OH (ASH) 21,134 3.9 Youngstown, Ohio (YOH) 89,818 3.8 Ashtabula, OH (ASH) 103,026 4.4 Raton Basin, Colorado (RAT) 158,502 4.6 Guy, Arkansas (GAK) 158,502 4.7 Rocky Mountain Arsenal (RMA) 766,093 5.0 Raton Basin, Colorado (RAT) 845,344 4.3 Paradox Basin, Colorado (PBN) 1,320,850 5.3 Raton Basin, Colorado (RAT) 3,170,040 5.7 Prague, Oklahoma (POK) While “McGarr found a relationship between the maximum magnitude of induced earthquakes and the total volume of fluid injected into a site” (Balcerak, 2013), James Verdon reminds us that the McGarr model “is only empirical, there is no real physics behind it” (Verdon, 2013a). McGarr’s model does, however, create an interesting framework for further theoretical and experimental work, while also leading to the derivation of the McGarr equation for injection-induced seismicity: M0(max) = G?v, with M0(max) = magnitude of largest seismic moment, G = shear modulus of rock (ratio of shear stress to shear strain), and ?v = total volume of fluid injected. Despite potential shortcomings, Verdon does admit that, “In the meantime, we are left with the empirical McGarr equation as our main guide” (Verdon, 2013a). He also makes certain to clarify: “It should of course be remembered that the McGarr equation does not tell you the maximum magnitude you will get in an operation. […] The McGarr line tells you the maximum magnitude you could get if you are very unlucky” (Verdon, 2013a). While McGarr continues to clarify the undeniable connection between the total injected fluid volume and the potential maximum magnitude of induced earthquakes, he does not find the rate of fluid injection to impact the magnitude of triggered earthquakes, but rather he found “that the rate of injection of fluid influences the frequency of induced earthquakes” (Balcerak, 2013).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Part 240: Seismicity (240.796) Various Methods for Disposing of Fracking Wastewater While there are current alternatives to deep-well injection for disposing of fracking wastewater, scientists and regulators alike agree that the other options are generally far more expensive while embodying additional environmental risks (Lustgarten, 2013a). These alternatives, the first three of which have been utilized extensively in the Marcellus region due to lack of suitable geology for underground injection (MSAC, 2011), include: (1) Processing of wastewater at municipal wastewater treatment facility with final discharge into a local waterway; (2) Processing of wastewater at a private industrial wastewater facility, with either discharge into a local waterway or reuse of the treated effluent in fracking wells; (3) Recycling of wastewater and reuse of the partially treated effluent in fracking wells; (4) Burning of waste; (5) Disposal of waste by application on roadways and other surfaces (Lutz et al, 2013; Lustgarten, 2012a); and unfortunately, (6) “Fracking flowback is dumped into rivers, lakes and reservoirs” (Eco Watch, 2013). Cliff Frohlich, senior research scientist at University of Texas at Austin’s Institute for Geophysics, reminds us that “the people involved in this are going to do the cheapest way of doing things that is generally considered safe” (Henry, 2012a), and that is currently why more than 95% of fracking wastewater is injected into deep wells (Clark and Veil, 2009). Journalist Abrahm Lustgarten, however, reminds us that, “several key experts acknowledged that the idea that injection is safe rests on science that has not kept pace with reality, and on oversight that doesn't always work (Lustgarten, 2012a). It is not just the energy sector that is dependent on this form of waste elimination, as subterranean waste disposal is a cornerstone of the U.S. economy, with pharmaceutical, chemical and agricultural industries all being dependent upon deep-well injection for managing voluminous waste streams. Even carbon storage and sequestration that is the essential fossil fuel industry strategy for addressing climate change, as Lustgarten points out, “counts on pushing waste into rock formations below the earth's surface” (Lustgarten, 2012a).

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.330 Permit Modifications Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.330 Permit Modifications Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lora Chamberlain 6341 N. Glenwood, 1# Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer 5121 S. Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Angela Li Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen 6128 S. University Ave. Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Anna Woolery 5630 S University Ave Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Anna Woolery 5630 S University Ave Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour 1350 E 53rd St Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ava Benezra 1515 E 54th St #4 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave (2) Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky 5748 South Blackstone Ave Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky 5748 South Blackstone Ave Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco 5301 S Kimbark Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco 5301 S Kimbark Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco 5301 S Kimbark Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid 4607 N Malden St. Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid 4607 N Malden St. Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick 535 N. Clifton Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Cindy Chung 1302 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Cindy Chung 1302 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus 4803 N Kedzie Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emily Huang 1101 E 56th Street Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emily Huang 1101 E 56th Street Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emily Huang 1101 E 56th Street Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman 5346 S. Cornell Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding 1307 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jay 5625 S University Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessica Green 1009 E. 57th St. Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joe Kapran 5423 S. Dorchester AVe Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joe Kapran 5423 S. Dorchester AVe Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, John Gamino 1210 E Hyde Park Blvd Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, John Gamino 1210 E Hyde Park Blvd Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, John Haggerty NYC, NY 11215

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jonathan Guy Burton Judson Hall, 1005 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jonathan Guy Burton Judson Hall, 1005 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Katie Lettie 5508 S Cornell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Katie Lettie 5508 S Cornell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kayli Horne 911 E. 54th St Apt 204 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kayli Horne 911 E. 54th St Apt 204 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kayli Horne 911 E. 54th St Apt 204 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kevin Casto 1215 E Hyde Park Blvd, Apt 107 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kevin Casto 1215 E Hyde Park Blvd, Apt 107 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kevin Casto 1215 E Hyde Park Blvd, Apt 107 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas 1414 E 59th Street Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Lucia Amorelli 1690 Sheppard Ln. Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Maheema Haque 1307 E 60th St. Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Molly Blondell 1101 E 56th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Molly Blondell 1101 E 56th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza 1101 E 56th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Slivka Residence Hall Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonum Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonum Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonum Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, TX 75075

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, TX 75075

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz 5630 S 56th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz 5630 S 56th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachel Katz 1515 E. 54th St, Apt 4 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachel Katz 1515 E. 54th St, Apt 4 Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster 5122 S. University Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster 5122 S. University Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, NY 11791

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, NY 11791

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Burton Judson Hall, 1005 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rob Ginger 5 South Lincoln Ave Addison, IL 60101

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Burton Judson Hall, 1005 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Burton Judson Hall, 1005 E 60th St Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sam Vexler 5211 S. Greenwood Ave. Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi 1005 E. 60th St. Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi 1005 E. 60th St. Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi 1005 E. 60th St. Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" wouldqq allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sandra Nickerson West Dundee, IL 60118

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva 1101 East 56th Street Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tim Law 5625 S. Ellis Ave Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tim Law 5625 S. Ellis Ave Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Tracy Noel 508 Pearl Marseilles, IL 61341

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas 1414 E 59th St, Room 471 Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas 1414 E 59th St, Room 471 Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas 1414 E 59th St, Room 471 Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Section 1-53(a)(4) of the Statute states that hydraulic fracturing operations "will be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." This portion of the regulations was incorporated into subsection 245.300(c)(4) of the rules, which, although not as strict, makes clear that no permit may be issued unless the high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations at issue "are reasonably expected to be conducted in a manner that will protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution or diminution of any water source." But Subsection 245.330(d) seems to imply that a permit modification that poses a "serious risk" to public health or the environment could nonetheless be granted without changes that eliminate that risk. While we disagree with the loosening of the language of 1-53 the regs to 245.300 of the rules, it would be difficult to imagine that a rule that expects fracking to be conducted in a manner that will "protect the public health and safety and prevent pollution of diminution of any water source" would allow fracking to occur when a "serious risk" exists. Revisions Needed: At a minimum, the following language should be added to this subsection: "Modification to a permit shall not be granted unless and until the proposed action is modified so that the criteria set forth in subsection 245.300(c)(4) are met."

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed. I also ask for another public hearing within Chicago!

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon 525 South State St. (Apt 1326) Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed. I also ask for another public hearing within Chicago!

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon 525 South State St. (Apt 1326) Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Johnathan Guy Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Peter Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachel Pinker Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rachelle Ankney Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, robert yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ryan Kidman Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Schuyler Sanderson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Yijian Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.”It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed.Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

What should be required on a permit application when modifications are made. How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.330 Permit Modifications Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

In reference to Subpart C: Permit Decisions

Section 245.330 Permit Modifications

What should be required on a permit application when modifications are made. How does this affect me: Who is in control Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.330 Permit Modifications Subsection 245.330(b)(1) states, “Sections of a permit modification application that are not the subject of a proposed deviation from an original permit are not required to be completed.” It is entirely possible that a potential significant impact of a modification would not be the “subject of” the modification but rather a consequence of it and those portions of a permit modification should be required to be completed. Revisions Needed: This language in this section should be modified to state that sections “that are not impacted by” the proposed modifications need not be completed.

Sincerely, Janet McDonnell 1322 North Vail Avenue Arlington Heights, IL 60004

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Dear IDNR, Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil. Kurt

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Dear IDNR, Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil. Kurt

Sincerely, Kurt Brian Witteman 425 S Wabash Ave WBRH 41 Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Illinois has become the poster child for how NOT to produce energy safely. - Illinois' marriage to old coal-fired power plants as the single largest source of industrial air pollution, has cut short thousands of Illinois lives and sickened many thousands. Campaign contributions by Midwest Generation and others ensured unconscionable delays in providing the scrubber technology that would have reduced these numbers. - Illinois leads the country in the number of nuclear reactors; with four of the same model that blew in Fukushima. Cancers plague the communities in which reactors are located - witness Braidwood. Tritium leaks and other releases are commonplace. Campaign contributions by Exelon to our elected officials are also commonplace - ensuring the continuation of inadequate enforcement, lack of improvements, and automatic of renewal of licenses of old and dangerous plants to poison for decades more. Stockpiles of Illinois' nuclear waste threatens the health and safety of its residents. - No surprise that Illinois' elected officials are now embracing fracking - WITHOUT ADEQUATE STUDY, REFLECTION - AND WITH DISREGARD FOR DISTURBING FRACKING DISASTERS EXPERIENCED IN OTHER STATES. PROMINENTLY MAKE PUBLIC ALL CAMPAIGN DONATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS BY ANY PERSON OR COMPANY INVOLVED IN THE FRACKING INDUSTRY. NO BACKDOOR DEALS, NO SIDEDOOR DEALS. ILLINOIS RESIDENTS PAY DEARLY FOR THE MISTAKES AND ENRICHMENT OF ILLINOIS POLITICIANS! WE DESERVE BETTER!

Sincerely, Maureen Headington 6760 County Line Lane Burr Ridge, IL 60527

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Living in Chicago, its been a blessing having easy access to water. Being so close to Lake Michigan really made me appreciate the important part water plays in our lives. How we need it to survive and grow just like plants and animals do. Fracking threatens this very essential source of life. It is dangerous to the health of the planet and of the people on it. Cancer and earthquakes should not be the consequences of independent energy. I understand the benefits of fracking for natural gas but, the casualties current and future are insurmountable when deducing the risks and rewards. Hydraulic Fracking endangers municipal water source, stability of land, health of crops, and people. It releases large amounts of toxic chemical found in the fracking fluid to the environment and contains it in insufficient, dangerous, and unregulated pools. Evaporating into the air that everyone breaths may seem like a small cost but unless you are willing to switch places and live in these places where the fracking is occurring, you have no right to make the rules that don't effect you personally but benefit your pockets. I'm not trying to attack you or tell you how to do your job. We have all heard the term to treat others the way you wish to be treated. So protect us like you protect what you hold dearly, whether it be your home, friends, family, or children, because we are all out here trying to protect ours. Southern Illinois deserves better, America deserves better that sacrificing one person for one resource. Resources as we call them in reality aren't even resources, they are gifts, things we usually never get back. So please try harder to regulate and enforce justice in this situation because the natural gas you extract isn't worth the years cut of peoples lives, the fear, the danger, and the helplessness of loving where you live and where you grew up, and having to leave this place because it made you sick, because your water is flammable, because your crops are dead, and because others care more about money than people. Please choose people.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo 2423 N. Newcastle Ave (1) Chicago, IL 60707

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Living in Chicago, its been a blessing having easy access to water. Being so close to Lake Michigan really made me appreciate the important part water plays in our lives. How we need it to survive and grow just like plants and animals do. Fracking threatens this very essential source of life. It is dangerous to the health of the planet and of the people on it. Cancer and earthquakes should not be the consequences of independent energy. I understand the benefits of fracking for natural gas but, the casualties current and future are insurmountable when deducing the risks and rewards. Hydraulic Fracking endangers municipal water source, stability of land, health of crops, and people. It releases large amounts of toxic chemical found in the fracking fluid to the environment and contains it in insufficient, dangerous, and unregulated pools. Evaporating into the air that everyone breaths may seem like a small cost but unless you are willing to switch places and live in these places where the fracking is occurring, you have no right to make the rules that don't effect you personally but benefit your pockets. I'm not trying to attack you or tell you how to do your job. We have all heard the term to treat others the way you wish to be treated. So protect us like you protect what you hold dearly, whether it be your home, friends, family, or children, because we are all out here trying to protect ours. Southern Illinois deserves better, America deserves better that sacrificing one person for one resource. Resources as we call them in reality aren't even resources, they are gifts, things we usually never get back. So please try harder to regulate and enforce justice in this situation because the natural gas you extract isn't worth the years cut of peoples lives, the fear, the danger, and the helplessness of loving where you live and where you grew up, and having to leave this place because it made you sick, because your water is flammable, because your crops are dead, and because others care more about money than people. Please choose people.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo 2423 N. Newcastle Ave (1) Chicago, IL 60707

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

NO fracking in IL. We like our water and soil. Take your short term gain and long term pain somewhere else.

Sincerely, Greg Lucas 234 McClure Ave. Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

NO fracking in IL. We like our water and soil. Take your short term gain and long term pain somewhere else.

Sincerely, Greg Lucas 234 McClure Ave. Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

No one likes a roommate who eats all the food in the apartment and never replaces it. It would be even worse if, say, I rented your apartment and got rid of all of your furniture because I was going to stay more than a year. Then, as I moved out, I replaced a couple of pieces of the furniture to your exact specification, but left the majority of the apartment empty. You might get mad and ask, "How is someone supposed to live in an apartment with a couple of chairs and no bed?" Similarly, someone might be angry if an enormous well--like the one featured in this article about the thousands of abandoned Wyoming wells--were left unplugged and devoid of topsoil in their backyard. (http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/25/us/state-may-act-to-plug-abandoned-wyoming-wells-asnatural-gas-boom-ends.html?_r=0) The General Assembly wrote the hydraulic fracturing regulatory act so that top soil would have to be returned to well sites. Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its pre-drilling condition: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” (Section 1-95(c)) IDNR's rules more or less adhere to the Act in instances where drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, stipulating that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion (Section 245.410(d)). However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." While characteristics of the soil are indeed important--as in the characteristics of the furniture in my fictitious apartment--volume also matters. However, the rules do not require measurement of the soil removed to ensure that a similar quantity of soil is also used to fill the well. This is problematic because, like your partially furnished apartment, a well could be left partially filled. When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year, Section 245.410(d) must require that the fracking operator measure the volume of removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

No one likes a roommate who eats all the food in the apartment and never replaces it. It would be even worse if, say, I rented your apartment and got rid of all of your furniture because I was going to stay more than a year. Then, as I moved out, I replaced a couple of pieces of the furniture to your exact specification, but left the majority of the apartment empty. You might get mad and ask, "How is someone supposed to live in an apartment with a couple of chairs and no bed?" Similarly, someone might be angry if an enormous well--like the one featured in this article about the thousands of abandoned Wyoming wells--were left unplugged and devoid of topsoil in their backyard. (http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/25/us/state-may-act-to-plug-abandoned-wyoming-wells-asnatural-gas-boom-ends.html?_r=0) The General Assembly wrote the hydraulic fracturing regulatory act so that top soil would have to be returned to well sites. Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its pre-drilling condition: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” (Section 1-95(c)) IDNR's rules more or less adhere to the Act in instances where drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, stipulating that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion (Section 245.410(d)). However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." While characteristics of the soil are indeed important--as in the characteristics of the furniture in my fictitious apartment--volume also matters. However, the rules do not require measurement of the soil removed to ensure that a similar quantity of soil is also used to fill the well. This is problematic because, like your partially furnished apartment, a well could be left partially filled. When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year, Section 245.410(d) must require that the fracking operator measure the volume of removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

No one likes a roommate who eats all the food in the apartment and never replaces it. It would be even worse if, say, I rented your apartment and got rid of all of your furniture because I was going to stay more than a year. Then, as I moved out, I replaced a couple of pieces of the furniture to your exact specification, but left the majority of the apartment empty. You might get mad and ask, "How is someone supposed to live in an apartment with a couple of chairs and no bed?" Similarly, someone might be angry if an enormous well--like the one featured in this article about the thousands of abandoned Wyoming wells--were left unplugged and devoid of topsoil in their backyard. (http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/25/us/state-may-act-to-plug-abandoned-wyoming-wells-asnatural-gas-boom-ends.html?_r=0) The General Assembly wrote the hydraulic fracturing regulatory act so that top soil would have to be returned to well sites. Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its pre-drilling condition: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” (Section 1-95(c)) IDNR's rules more or less adhere to the Act in instances where drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, stipulating that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion (Section 245.410(d)). However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." While characteristics of the soil are indeed important--as in the characteristics of the furniture in my fictitious apartment--volume also matters. However, the rules do not require measurement of the soil removed to ensure that a similar quantity of soil is also used to fill the well. This is problematic because, like your partially furnished apartment, a well could be left partially filled. When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year, Section 245.410(d) must require that the fracking operator measure the volume of removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Adriana Caballero Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, James Wauer Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Jan A Pietrzak 12031 S 72nd Ct Palos Heights, IL 60463

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Jan A Pietrzak 12031 S 72nd Ct Palos Heights, IL 60463

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Joey Knotts Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo 2423 N. Newcastle Ave (1) Chicago, IL 60707

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo 2423 N. Newcastle Ave (1) Chicago, IL 60707

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Melissa Wangall Galesburg, IL 61401

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Micah Bennett Marion, IL 62959

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nick Phillips Evanston, IL 60201

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Paloma Delgadillo Plano, IL 75075

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME AND DEPTH. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity, INCLUDING DEPTH of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition.Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed."What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed.Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Shari Katz Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Subpart D: Well Site Preparation (245.44-245.410) 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

Subpart D: Well Site Preparation (245.44-245.410) 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions Sections 1-70(b)2 and 1-95(c) of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act state that stripped topsoil is to be replaced with similar soil and the site returned to its predrilling condition. Section 1-95(c) of the Act specifically states: “The operator shall restore any lands used by the operator other than the well site and production facility to a condition as closely approximating the pre-drilling conditions that existed before the land was disturbed for any stage of site preparation activities, drilling, and high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing operations.” When drilling is anticipated to be completed in less than a year, Section 245.410(d) of the Rules stipulates that the topsoil is to stockpiled and stabilized to prevent erosion. However, “In the event it is anticipated that the final reclamation shall take place in excess of one year from drilling the well, the topsoil may be disposed of in any lawful manner provided the permittee reclaims the site with topsoil of similar characteristics of the topsoil removed." What is missing, and needed, in this section of the Rules is the stipulation that the replacement topsoil will be not only similar in characteristics of the topsoil removed, but also match the removed topsoil in VOLUME. In fact, there is no place in the rules that requires measurement of the topsoil removed or measurement of the replacement topsoil. Without such a requirement, it would be easy for an unscrupulous operator to replace the topsoil with smaller quantities than were originally removed. Revisions Needed: When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, B. E. Murphy 458 Tahoe Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart D: Well Site Preparation

Section 245.410 Access Roads, Public Roads and Topsoil Conditions

When final reclamation is anticipated to exceed one year and topsoil is removed from the site, Section 245.410(d) must require measuring the volume of the removed topsoil and stipulate that the replacement topsoil will match both the quality AND quantity of the removed topsoil.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

According to the miles-to-feet converter I found on Google, there are 5280 feet in a mile. So it stands to reason that there are up to 10,560 feet along the length of the horizontal well bore. There is significant evidence of the possibility of surface and groundwater contamination from fracking operations. So why are we not requiring testing along the length of the horizontal well bore? This is a serious oversight that must absolutely be remedied. Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

According to the miles-to-feet converter I found on Google, there are 5280 feet in a mile. So it stands to reason that there are up to 10,560 feet along the length of the horizontal well bore. There is significant evidence of the possibility of surface and groundwater contamination from fracking operations. So why are we not requiring testing along the length of the horizontal well bore? This is a serious oversight that must absolutely be remedied. Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

According to the miles-to-feet converter I found on Google, there are 5280 feet in a mile. So it stands to reason that there are up to 10,560 feet along the length of the horizontal well bore. There is significant evidence of the possibility of surface and groundwater contamination from fracking operations. So why are we not requiring testing along the length of the horizontal well bore? This is a serious oversight that must absolutely be remedied. Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

According to the miles-to-feet converter I found on Google, there are 5280 feet in a mile. So it stands to reason that there are up to 10,560 feet along the length of the horizontal well bore. There is significant evidence of the possibility of surface and groundwater contamination from fracking operations. So why are we not requiring testing along the length of the horizontal well bore? This is a serious oversight that must absolutely be remedied. Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago , IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

According to the miles-to-feet converter I found on Google, there are 5280 feet in a mile. So it stands to reason that there are up to 10,560 feet along the length of the horizontal well bore. There is significant evidence of the possibility of surface and groundwater contamination from fracking operations. So why are we not requiring testing along the length of the horizontal well bore? This is a serious oversight that must absolutely be remedied. Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago , IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Drilling should not be taking place so close to the New Madrid fault line.

Sincerely, Madeleine McLeester Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

How can we ignore the risks of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals throughout the entire process of fracking?

Sincerely, Genarose Buechler Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

How does this affect me: Water Integrity Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: “Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." ” --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: “"[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.)” Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. Thank you, John O'Donohue

Sincerely, John O'Donohue 624 S. AshlandS La aGrange, IL 60525

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

I am concerned about the danger of contamination of ground water since the proposed regulations do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which could be as much as two miles.

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

It must be mandatory to test the length of the well bore completely, not just 1500 feet. Rob Jackson of Duke Univ. Says methane travels 3300 feet. The length of 1500 feet is arbitrary and not a science based standard. Rewrite 245.600 according to the intent of protecting Illinois families and water ways, etc.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus 1806 Marion Ct. Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

It must be mandatory to test the length of the well bore completely, not just 1500 feet. Rob Jackson of Duke Univ. Says methane travels 3300 feet. The length of 1500 feet is arbitrary and not a science based standard. Rewrite 245.600 according to the intent of protecting Illinois families and water ways, etc.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus 1806 Marion Ct. Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

It must be mandatory to test the length of the well bore completely, not just 1500 feet. Rob Jackson of Duke Univ. Says methane travels 3300 feet. The length of 1500 feet is arbitrary and not a science based standard. Rewrite 245.600 according to the intent of protecting Illinois families and water ways, etc.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus 1806 Marion Ct. Wheaton, IL 60187

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Its absurd to me that when our government praises our first surplus of nationally produced oil in decades, that they would turn around and endanger the most essential building block in life purely just to have "more" oil. As Midwesterner's, we are PRIVILEGED to source our water from the largest fresh water aquifer on the planet, think about that hard for a second...783 million people do not have access to clean water and almost 2.5 billion do not have access to adequate sanitation. We have both. This bill poses a serious threat that WILL have life long/generational consequences. No Fracking!

Sincerely, Doug Baird Chicago, IL 60622

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Its absurd to me that when our government praises our first surplus of nationally produced oil in decades, that they would turn around and endanger the most essential building block in life purely just to have "more" oil. As Midwesterner's, we are PRIVILEGED to source our water from the largest fresh water aquifer on the planet, think about that hard for a second...783 million people do not have access to clean water and almost 2.5 billion do not have access to adequate sanitation. We have both. This bill poses a serious threat that WILL have life long/generational consequences. No Fracking!

Sincerely, Doug Baird Chicago, IL 60622

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Its absurd to me that when our government praises our first surplus of nationally produced oil in decades, that they would turn around and endanger the most essential building block in life purely just to have "more" oil. As Midwesterner's, we are PRIVILEGED to source our water from the largest fresh water aquifer on the planet, think about that hard for a second...783 million people do not have access to clean water and almost 2.5 billion do not have access to adequate sanitation. We have both. This bill poses a serious threat that WILL have life long/generational consequences. No Fracking!

Sincerely, Doug Baird Chicago, IL 60622

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Monitoring and testing should not be simply done within 1,500 feet of the well site, but more importantly, along the horizontal leg of the well bore, where groundwater and surface water is at heightened risk of contamination from underground migration of carcinogenic fracking fluid. If not rectified, this rule will trigger widespread environmental and public health concerns.

Sincerely, Ashley Williams Ottawa, IL 61350

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Monitoring and testing should not be simply done within 1,500 feet of the well site, but more importantly, along the horizontal leg of the well bore, where groundwater and surface water is at heightened risk of contamination from underground migration of carcinogenic fracking fluid. If not rectified, this rule will trigger widespread environmental and public health concerns.

Sincerely, Ashley Williams Ottawa, IL 61350

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Monitoring and testing should not be simply done within 1,500 feet of the well site, but more importantly, along the horizontal leg of the well bore, where groundwater and surface water is at heightened risk of contamination from underground migration of carcinogenic fracking fluid. If not rectified, this rule will trigger widespread environmental and public health concerns.

Sincerely, Ashley Williams Ottawa, IL 61350

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Monitoring Water Quality: Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, sigi psimenos elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Monitoring Water Quality: Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes

Sincerely, Eric Morris Carbondale, IL 62902

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects.

Sincerely, Gerson omar Ramirez 4414 N christiana Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects.

Sincerely, Gerson omar Ramirez 4414 N christiana Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring . Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. “"[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.)” Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) it doesnt make sense to me, from a geological perspective, why the proposed rules do not force companies to test along the horizontal leg of the well bore. I know from my professors in the past that contamination can extend for up to two miles horizontally from the bore site. I have many friends that live in unincorporated areas where they must have wells for their own water, and this possibility of contamination is terrifying. Private companies should NOT be allowed, by law, to contaminate the water of property owners, not to mention our precious public water supply.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) it doesnt make sense to me, from a geological perspective, why the proposed rules do not force companies to test along the horizontal leg of the well bore. I know from my professors in the past that contamination can extend for up to two miles horizontally from the bore site. I have many friends that live in unincorporated areas where they must have wells for their own water, and this possibility of contamination is terrifying. Private companies should NOT be allowed, by law, to contaminate the water of property owners, not to mention our precious public water supply.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Alyssa Carabez Carabez Brookfield, IL 60573

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Ammar Kalimullah Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Ashley Seymour Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Baylee Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian 5121 S Kenwood Ave Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Bob Venier Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Brent Ritzel 810 N. Springer St. Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Brianna Tong 5122 S University Ave (#1) Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Edith Villavicencio New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Emma LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Gerry Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Hannah Campbell Gustafson Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Jay Keating 17007 S 82nd Avenue tinley park, IL 60477

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, jd paulus wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, John Gamino Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Karina Hendren Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Kayli Horne Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Kelsey Bratanch itasca, IL 60143

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes.In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk:Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects."--From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found".The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals:"[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.)Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.(The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Keri Curtis Peru, IL 61354

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Linda Green 422 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Luke Dobbs Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects."

Sincerely, M Alan Wurth Red Bud, IL 62278

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, M Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Mary Mathews Lake Forest, IL 60045

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Matt Steffen Lake Zurich, IL 60047

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Nancy Freehafer chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Nancy Onderdonk 1456 W Granville Chicago, IL 60660

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Norma Claire Moruzzi Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: “ Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." ” --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: “ "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) ” Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: “ Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." ” --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: “ "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) ” Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: “ Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." ” --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: “ "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) ” Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Patti Walker RR#2 (Box42a) Karbers Ridge, IL 62955

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Rachael Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Raymond D. Gayton 453 Tahoe Street Park Forest, IL 60466

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Rebecca Foster Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Rebekah Sugarman Syosset, IL 11791

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Robert Yancey 570 Sorento Ave Sorento, IL 62086

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, sam zacher Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago , IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Sean Tyler Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Shreya Kalva Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Shreya Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60061

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, sonja chan 944 w walnut st kankakee, IL 60901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Stanley Archacki Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Tarek Amrouch Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.)

Sincerely, Tim brooks Chicago, IL 60652

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Tyler

Sincerely, Tyler Hansen Oak Park, IL 60304

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Vincent Beltrano Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Virginia Baker Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Section 245.600(b)(1) of the proposed rules provides for the testing and monitoring of water sources within 1,500 feet of the well site. Among the many problems with the monitoring provisions, the proposed rules do not provide for testing along the horizontal leg of the well bore, which can extend for up to two miles from the well site. This is a reckless disregard of the known risk of the underground migration of toxic fluids from a horizontal well bore, especially when hydraulic fracturing involves the use of explosive charges and especially in areas known for the risk of higher-magnitude earthquakes. In a report issued on September 5, 2012, the U.S. Government Accountability Office acknowledged this risk: Oil and gas development, whether conventional or shale oil and gas, pose inherent environmental and public health risks, but the extent of these risks associated with shale oil and gas development is unknown, in part, because the studies GAO reviewed do not generally take into account the potential long-term, cumulative effects." --From: Information on Shale Resources, Development, and Environmental and Public Health Risks, U.S. Government Accountability Office, GAO-12-732 (2012), "What GAO Found". The agency mentioned specifically the risk of underground migration of toxic gases and chemicals: "[A] number of studies and publications GAO reviewed indicate that shale oil and gas development poses risks to water quality from contamination of surface water and groundwater as a result of erosion from ground disturbances, spills and releases of chemicals and other fluids, or underground migration of gases and chemicals." (Emphasis added.) Water testing and monitoring should be required all along the length of any horizontal well bores. (The Government Accountability Office is an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress.) Solution: Water testing should be required not only within a 1500 feet radius of the well site but also within 1500 feet around any point of any horizontal well bore.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

This stuff is nasty, any type of ecosystem services analysis will illustrate it is going to lose money if you take into loss of quality of life. No Fracking in Illinois

Sincerely, Eric Sterling DeKalb, IL 60115

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Without disclosure of the elements used in fracking process we are at a clear disadvantage.

Sincerely, Gary Champagne Des Plaines, IL 60016

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.600 Water Quality Monitoring

Without disclosure of the elements used in fracking process we are at a clear disadvantage.

Sincerely, Gary Champagne Des Plaines, IL 60016

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to current list of indicator chemicals in the proposed regulations but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Eileen Sutter 4125 North Monticello Chicago, IL 60618

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Determining if water pollution has occurred How does this affect me: Water Integrity Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart F: Water Quality (245.600-245.630) 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Stephanie Bilenko LaGrange Park, IL 60526

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

I am writing as a student terrified of a future of climate catastrophe. These rules indicate a lack of attention to basic protections for the health and safety of Illinois residents. There are an overwhelming number of holes in these rules, and so many of them put our health at risk. Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin 4750 N Sheridan Chicago, IL 606040

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

I am writing as a student terrified of a future of climate catastrophe. These rules indicate a lack of attention to basic protections for the health and safety of Illinois residents. There are an overwhelming number of holes in these rules, and so many of them put our health at risk. Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin 4750 N Sheridan Chicago, IL 606040

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

I am writing as a student terrified of a future of climate catastrophe. These rules indicate a lack of attention to basic protections for the health and safety of Illinois residents. There are an overwhelming number of holes in these rules, and so many of them put our health at risk. Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin 4750 N Sheridan Chicago, IL 606040

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

I am writing as a student terrified of a future of climate catastrophe. These rules indicate a lack of attention to basic protections for the health and safety of Illinois residents. There are an overwhelming number of holes in these rules, and so many of them put our health at risk. Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin 4750 N Sheridan Chicago, IL 606040

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

If it is IDNR's duty "To approve horizontal fracking conditionally based on the safeguarding of public health and public safety, and the protection of the environment," why would IDNR horizontal fracking rules undercut the law regarding Water Quality Monitoring? If the act governing water quality monitoring does not limit the number of chemicals that would indicate water contamination, and over 700 chemicals are used in fracking, why would IDNR limit the number of testable chemicals to the chemicals listed in the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring? The list provided in the act are _indicators_ of water contamination, and the list is not meant to be comprehensive, so why did IDNR write the rules as if the list is comprehensive? Fracking operators should be held responsible for any pollution or diminution in water quality caused by the fracking process. The IDNR fracking rules should require water testing for all chemicals used in the fracturing process, and not just a list of indicator chemicals.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

It concerns me that although there are around 700 chemicals that can contaminate our water supply, only a portion of those chemicals can be used as an indicator for contamination. Logically, it should require that if any chemical that the fracking operator is using is found in the water supply, especially ones which do not correspond to other operations in the area, would be an indicator of contamination. This is extremely important to me because of the safety of drinking water in the area. Also, the waterways are important ecological zones for those who engage in fishing and other recreational activities involved in Illinois. It could cause property values to drop, especially properties with wells, and could endanger recreational areas that families frequent. Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: Subpart F: Water Quality (245.600-245.630) 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution. Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Andrew Panelli 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Abby Dompke Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Aija Nemer-Aanerud Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alen Makhmudov Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Alex Farrenkopf Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alexandra Lynn Chicago, IL 606

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Amelia Dmouska Chciago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Anna Betts Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Anna Ronnen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ashely Ernst Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Benjamin Boyajian Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Benjamin Chametzky Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Bianca Chamusco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bonnie Krodel Westmont, IL 60559

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Brandi Madrid Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Breanna Champion Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Bruce Ostdick Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Chris Turner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Colleen Dennis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dan Perry Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Diamond Hartwell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Donovan Snyder Snyder Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Durango Mendoza Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Dylon Busser Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, E Zemin Champaign, IL 61821

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alphaBenzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alphaBenzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Elias Friedman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Elizabeth A. Cerny 7728 Williams St. Downers Grove, IL 60516

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Patula Makanda, IL 62958

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Elizabeth Scrafford chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Emerson Delgado Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Emilio Joseph Comay del Junco Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Emily Huang Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Erik Ontiveros Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Eve Zuckerman CHicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Florence Elgin, IL 60123

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, France's Hoffman Chicago, IL 60657

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Francis Beach Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Francisco Spaulding Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Frank Pettis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Gadrel Williams Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Garrick Balk 236 Prairie Street South Elgin, IL 60177-1528

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Gianna Chacon Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alphaBenzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Girwana Baker Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Glen Edward Litchfield Darien, IL 60561

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Grace Pai Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Gus Novoa Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Hannah Kershner Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Harry Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jady YTolda chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, James Alstrum Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jasha Sommer-Simpson Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jason Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jay Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jeff Engstrom Urbana, IL 61801

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jessa Dahl Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jesse Silliman Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jessica Green Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jill Paulus Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, joann conrad 13 red oak lane springfield, IL 62712

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Joanna Stauder Belleville, IL 62220

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Joe Kapran Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Johh Haggerty NYC, IL 11215

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, John Hunt Chicago, IL 60641

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jonny Gill Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Jorge Sanchez Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Joseph Gary New York, IL 10003

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Julia Ogilvie 1806 Marion Court Wheaton, IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kaijie Wang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kaitlon Busser Dixon, IL 61021

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kathryn Chapman Hamburg, IL 62045

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kathy Machaj Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alphaBenzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Katie Lettie Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kelsey Chicago, IL 60631

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ken Buck Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kevin Casto Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kiehlor Mack Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kris Chatterjee Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kristen Rosario Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Kurt Witteman Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Lauren San Juan Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Lavine Hemlani Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Leilani Douglas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Lexington Lawson Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Lindsay Paulus Wheaton , IL 60187

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alphaBenzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Liza Pono Chicago, IL 60616

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Louis Clark Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Lupita Carrasquillo Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Luz Magdaleno Chicago, IL 60632

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, M J Smerken Murphysboro, IL 62966

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, maayan olshan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Maddison Davis Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Madeline McCann Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Maheema Haque Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Mansi Kathuria Chicago, IL 60647

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Marissa Godlewski Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Mary Ellen Barbezat Elgin, IL 60120

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Mary Trimmer Granite City, IL 62040

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Maryann Condren Naperville, IL 60540

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Matt Chappell Tuscola, IL 61953

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Matthew Raigosa Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Michael Lang 1206 N Elmwood Peoria, IL 61606

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Michael Lang 1206 N Elmwood Peoria, IL 61606

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Michael Perino Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Michelle Mejia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Mike Benz Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Min Li Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Molly Blondell Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Molly Connor Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Nancy Penney Monticello, IL 61856

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Natalya Glaser Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Navroz Tharani Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Neeta D'Souza Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Nicholas Andrew Luthi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Noah Hellermann New York, IL 11218

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Nora Helfand Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Nour Abdelmonem Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Olivia Stovicek Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Padgham Larson Galena, IL 61036

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. (SEE APRIL 2011 REPORT BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE http://democrats.energycommerce.house.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Hydraulic- Fracturing-Chemicals-2011-4-18.pdf) 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. (SEE APRIL 2011 REPORT BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE http://democrats.energycommerce.house.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Hydraulic- Fracturing-Chemicals-2011-4-18.pdf) 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Panelli Juliana 12051 Mackinac Rd Homer Glen, IL 60491

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Patricia Simpson Philo, IL 61864

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Patrick Dexter Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Paul Kim Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Paul Papoutzz Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Paulo Nacimiento Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Preethi Sekhar Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Rachel Baker Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Rachel Katz Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Raegan N Sheedy 426 East 450 North Rd MORRISONVILLE, IL 62546

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Raj Kapoor Oak Park, IL 60302

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ramon Valladarez Chicago, IL 60642

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Rebecca McBride Mahomet, IL 61875

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Rebecca Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Reed Mershon Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Roberta Weiner Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Roderick Luke Chan Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Rohit Satishchandra Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ron Yehoshua Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Ryn Grantham Grantham Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sam Vexler Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Samantha Martin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sandeep Malladi Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alphaBenzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sarah Kindt Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sarah Quesnell Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sasha Mitrofanenko Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alphaBenzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Scott Condren Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Shaden Amara Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Shawn Mukherji Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Shrabya Timinsia Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Simone Serhan Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sloane Moore River Forest, IL 60305

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Sophia Johnson Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Ta Promlee Chicago, IL 60645

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Tim Dompke Collinsville, IL 62224

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Tim Law Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Tommy Talley Chicago, IL 60617

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Tori Root Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Tybee McLaughlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Vadim Tanyoin Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Veronica Murashige Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Vik Lobo Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Weili Zheng Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Westin Campo chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Westin Campo Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Will Fernandez Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, William LaBounty Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, William Thomas Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, William Toole Godfrey, IL 62035

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Young-In Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Yvette McGivern Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Zach Taylor Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

Section 1-80 of the Act governing Water Quality Monitoring provides a list of indicator chemicals that would suggest water contamination has occurred but doesn't limit what may be tested for. In fact, this section of the law states that "Sampling shall, at a minimum, be consistent with the work plan and allow for a determination of whether any hydraulic fracturing additive or other contaminant has caused pollution or diminution for purposes of Sections 1-83 and 1-85 of this Act." Section 1-85 of the Act governing the presumption of pollution or diminution does not limit the sources of sampling data that may be used to prove the pollution or diminution has occurred. And yet, the IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for. The 1-80 parameters are intended to be INDICATORS of the presence of contamination from hydraulic fracturing, not an exclusive list of the possible contaminating constituents. There are over 700 chemicals used in fracking. 1-80 lists only a handful of them. A reasonable person would conclude that if a chemical other than those on the list of indicator chemicals was found and that chemical was part of the list of chemicals in the fracking operator's work plan, then the operator would be presumed to be responsible for that contamination. Section 1-85(a) states that it "establishes a rebuttable presumption for the purposes of evidence and liability under State law regarding claims of pollution or diminution of a water source and for use regarding the investigation and order authority under Section 1- 83" (emphasis added). The "and" is disjunctive, such that claims for pollution and diminution are not tied to or contingent on the investigation and order authority under section 1-83. Regardless, nothing in section 1-83 limits investigation and order authority to the constituents tested for under section 1-80; on the contrary, that section expressly references "pollution or diminution," which as discussed above is broadly defined with reference to the Illinois Administrative Code. See section 1-83(a) ("Any person who has reason to believe they have incurred pollution or diminution of a water source as a result of high volume hydraulic fracturing treatment of a well may notify the Department and request that an investigation be conducted") (emphasis added) and 1-83(d) ("if sampling results or other information obtained as part of the investigation or the results of tests conducted under subsection (c) of Section 1-80 of this Act indicate [pollution or diminution violations], the Department shall issue an order…") (emphasis added). In sum, it is clear hat section 85 of the Act creates a presumption of liability for all constituents contained in the Act's definition of "pollution or diminution," not solely for the constituents tested for under section 1-80. Revisions Needed: Section 245.620 must reflect the intent of the law that the operator will be responsible for any pollution or diminution caused by fracking. This responsibility will not be limited to a list of indicator chemicals but will include all chemicals used in the fracturing process. Furthermore a number of provisions in the draft rules nonetheless inappropriately purport to limit evidence triggering the presumption to the section 1-80 sampling results. The particular provisions of concern are as follows: a. 245.620(b)(2) – the word "the" before "baseline water quality data" should be stricken to make clear that any baseline water quality data, not just the data collected pursuant to the

Act's requirements, may trigger the presumption. b. 245.620(b)(4) – this section should preferably be amended to mirror subparagraph (b)(2) (amended per above recommendation), i.e., state that "water quality data obtained up to 30 months after commencement of HVHHF operations shows that pollution or diminution of water quality has occurred with respect to one or more parameters" set forth in the relevant section of the Environmental Protection Act regulations referenced at 245.610(e). c. 245.620(c)(4) – this section is superfluous, as well as confusing for the reason specified below. If the water quality data (broadly defined per above) do not show pollution or diminution, then there is no presumption to rebut. The relevant concept from the statute that should be reflected here, and is not, is from subsection 1-85(c)(3), specifying that the presumption can be rebutted if it can be affirmatively established that the pollution or diminution had an identifiable cause other than HVHHF operations. To illustrate how severely the Department's unauthorized limitation of section 1-85 of the Act has curtailed its scope, we offer the following list of chemicals that are covered by the statutory definition of "pollution or diminution" that should therefore also be subject to the presumption according to the plain language of section 1-85. Shown capitalized are the few constituents that remain subject to the presumption under the Department's truncated interpretation: • Detection of any: BENZENE, any other carcinogen • Preventive Response Criteria at 35 IAC 620.310(a)(3)(A)(i): para-dichlorobenzene, ortho-dichlorobenzene, methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE), phenols, styrene, TOLUENE, ETHYLBENZENE, XYLENES, • 35 IAC 620.410: (a) antimony, ARSENIC, BARIUM, beryllium, CADMIUM, CHLORIDE, CHROMIUM, cobalt, copper, cyanide, fluoride, IRON, LEAD, MANGANESE, MERCURY, nickel, nitrate as n, perchlorate, Radium-226, Radium-228, SELENIUM, SILVER, SULFATE, thallium, TDS, vanadium, zinc; (b) Acenaphthene, Acetone, Alachlor*, Aldicarb, Anthracene, Atrazine, Benzene [repeat], Benzo(a)anthracene*, Benzo(b)flouranthene*, Benzo(k)floranthene*, Benzo(a)pyrene*, Benzoic acid, 2-Butanone (MEK), Carbofuran, Carbon Disulfide, Carbon Tetrachloride, Chlordane*, Chloroform*, Chrysene*, Dalapon, Dibenzo(a,h) anthracene*, Dicamba, Dichlorodiflouromethane; 1,1-Dichloroethane, Dichloromethane*, Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate*, Diethyl Phthalate, Di-n-butyl Phthalate, Dinoseb, Endothall, Endrin, Ethylene Dibromide*, Flouranthene, Flourene, Heptachlor*, Heptachlor Epoxide*, Hexachlorocyclopentadiene, Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene*, Isopropylbenzene (Cumene), Lindane (Gamma-Haxachlorocyclohexane), 2,4-D, ortho-Dichlorobenzene, para-Dichlorobenzene; 1,2- Dibromo-3-Chloropropane*; 1,2-Dichloroethane*, 1,1 Dichloroethylene, cis-1,2- Dichloroethylene, trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene, 1,2-Dichloropropane*, Ethylbenzene, MCPP (Mecoprop), Methoxychlor, 2-Methylnaphthalene, 2-Methylphenol, Methyl Tertiary-Butyl Ether (MTBE), Monochlorobenzene, Naphthalene, P-Dioxane*, Pentachlorophenol*, Phenols, Picloram, Pyrene, Poly-chlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) (as decachloro-biphenyl)*, alpha-BHC (alpha- Benzene hexachloride)*, Simazine, Styrene, 2,4,5-TP (Silvex), Tetrachloroethylene*, Toluene, Toxaphene*, 1,1,1-Trichloroethane; 1,1,2-Trichloroethane; 1,2,4- Trichlorobenzene; Trichloroethylene*; Trichlorofluoromethane; Vinyl Chloride*, Xylenes; (c) 1,3-Dinitrobenzene, 2,4-Dinitrotoluene, 2,6-Dinitrotoluene, HMX (High Melting Explosive, Octogen); Nitrobenzene; RDX (Royal Demolition Explosive, Cyclonite), 1,3,5- Trinitrobenzene; 2,4,6- Trinitrotoluene (TNT); (d) [repeats]; (e) PH. • Chemicals with 35 IAC 720 Groundwater Cleanup Objectives (not already listed above): Aldrin, Bis(2-chloroethyl)ether, Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (Di(2- ethylhexyl)phthalate), DDD, DDE, DDT, 1,2-Dibromoethane, 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine, Dieldrin, Hexachlorobenzene, Alpha-HCH,

N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine, 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol, Bromodichloromethane (Dichlorobromomethane), Bromoform, Butanol, butyl benzyl phthalate, carbazole, 4-Chloroaniline (r-Chloroaniline), Chlorobenzene (Monochlorobenzene), Chlorodibromomethane (Dibromochloromethane), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.3), 2-Chlorophenol (pH 7.4-8.0), 1,1-Dichloroethane, 2,4-Dichlorophenol, 1,2-Dichloropropane; 1,3-Dichloropropene (1,3-Dichloropropylene, cis + trans); Diethyl phthalate; 2,4- Dimethylphenol; 2,4-Dinitrophenol; Di-n-octyl phthalate; Endosulfan, Hexachloroethane, Isophorone; Methyl bromide (Bromomethane); Methyl tertiary-butyl ether; Methylene chloride (Dichloromethane); 2-Methylphenol (o-Cresol); N-Nitrosodiphenylamine; N-Nitrosodi-npropylamine; Pentachlorophenol; 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-7.8); 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol (pH 7.9-8.0); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 4.9-6.8); 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol (pH 6.9-8.0); Vinyl acetate; Boron, CALCIUM; Chromium, ion, hexavalent; MAGNESIUM, phosphorus, potassium, sodium. We note that this concern is not by any means academic: at least some of these excluded constituents are found on FracFocus, indicating that they have been used in fracking operations.

Sincerely, Zaid Mctabi Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart F: Water Quality

Section 245.620 Rebuttable Presumption of Pollution or Diminution

The IDNR Rules in Section 245.620 have narrowed the statutory basis for the presumption, treating Section 1-80's list of "indicator chemicals" as a comprehensive list of what should be tested for in the event a complaint is filed. However: A 2011 report released by congressional Democrats lists)750 chemicals and compounds used by 14 oil and gas service companies from 2005 to 2009 used to help extract natural gas from the ground (see http://democrats.energycommerce.house.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Hydraulic- Fracturing-Chemicals-2011-4-18.pdf. That list includes 29 chemicals that are either known or possible carcinogens or are regulated regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act for their risks to human health, or listed as hazardous air pollutants under the Clean Air Act. During hydraulic fracturing, fluids containing chemicals are injected deep underground, where their migration is not entirely predictable. Well failures, such as the use of insufficient well casing, could lead to their release at shallower depths, closer to drinking water supplies. Although some fracturing fluids are removed from the well at the end of the fracturing process, a substantial amount remains underground (source: John A. Veil, Argonne National Laboratory, Water Management Technologies Used by Marcellus Shale Gas Producers, prepared for the Department of Energy (July 2010). The amount of fluid that remains in a well varies depending on local geology. In many cases, particularly in the Marcellus Shale in the Northeast, more than three-quarters of the fluid is left underground. (source: http://www.propublica.org/article/new-gas-wellsleave- more-chemicals-in-ground-hydraulic-fracturing) CONCERN - The IDNR should be working with scientists (not just industry specialists and environmental organizations) to develop rules that implement the intent of the regulations, which are to protect the public health, safety and welfare from harm associated with hydraulic fracturing. It is in the industry's best interest to limit testing to indicator chemicals, and perhaps in the agency's best interest as well, since it would be easier to determine pollution or diminution if the list of chemicals used to make that determination were finite or limited. However, according to the 2011 report by the House Committee on Energy and Commerce: "The companies used 94 million gallons of 279 products that contained at least one chemical or component that the manufacturers deemed proprietary or a trade secret. In many instances, the oil and gas service companies were unable to identify these "proprietary" chemicals, SUGGESTING THAT THE COMPANIES ARE INJECTING FLUIDS CONTAINING CHEMICALS THAT THEY THEMSELVES CANNOT IDENTIFY" (emphasis mine). The report further states that methanol, which was used in 342 hydraulic fracturing products, was the most widely used chemical between 2005 and 2009. The substance is a hazardous air pollutant and is on the candidate list for potential regulation under the Safe Water Drinking Act. Isopropyl alcohol, 2-butoxyethanol, and ethylene glycol were the other most widely used chemicals: * When ingested, isopropyl alcohol functions primarily as a central nervous system (CNS) inebriant and depressant, and its toxicity and treatment resemble that of ethanol. Fatality from isolated isopropyl alcohol toxicity is rare, but can result from injury due to inebriant effects, untreated coma with airway compromise, or rarely, cardiovascular depression and shock following massive ingestion. Supportive care can avert most

morbidity and mortality. source: http://www.uptodate.com/contents/isopropyl-alcohol-poisoning * Moderate respiratory exposure to 2-butoxyethanol often results in irritation of mucous membranes of the eyes, nose and throat. Heavy exposure via respiratory, dermal or oral routes can lead to hypotension, metabolic acidosis, hemolysis, pulmonary edema and coma. U.S. Employers are required to inform employees when they are working with this substance. Source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2-Butoxyethanol * Acute exposure of humans to ethylene glycol by ingesting large quantities causes three stages of health effects. CNS depression, including such symptoms as vomiting, drowsiness, coma, respiratory failure, convulsions, metabolic changes, and gastrointestinal upset are followed by cardiopulmonary effects and later renal damage. Source: http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/hlthef/ethy-gly.html NONE OF THESE CHEMICALS are listed as one of the indicator chemicals in either the rules or the regulations. CORRECTIVE ACTION - The list of chemicals included in Section 245.620 of the IDNR rules needs to be expanded to represent industry practices as presented in the 2011 report by the House Committee on Energy and Commerce AND any analysis provided by the scientific community that provides more comprehensive documentation. This Section also should include a provision that recognizes that chemicals or additives determined to be harmful to human health that are not listed in the rules also need to be taken into consideration when making a determination of pollution or diminution if such chemicals or additives were not present at the time of baseline testing.

Sincerely, Pamela J. Richart 1645 W. Jarvis Chicago, IL 60626

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

“Competitive value” is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of “competitive value” other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. “Competitive value” must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between “competitive value” and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

IDNR's administrative rules allow permit applicants to withhold information used in the fracking process based on "competitive value." However, this term is undefined in the rules and makes no exception for the public's right to know for reasons related to the public's and environmental health and potential occupational exposure. Competitive value should not become a catchall phrase that weighs profit more heavily than public health. The rules should clearly define competitive value. This term should in no way override the provision in the Illinois Constitution that guarantees its citizens a healthy and safe environment. All decisions must hold the health of Illinois citizens above all else.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

IDNR's administrative rules allow permit applicants to withhold information used in the fracking process based on "competitive value." However, this term is undefined in the rules and makes no exception for the public's right to know for reasons related to the public's and environmental health and potential occupational exposure. Competitive value should not become a catchall phrase that weighs profit more heavily than public health. The rules should clearly define competitive value. This term should in no way override the provision in the Illinois Constitution that guarantees its citizens a healthy and safe environment. All decisions must hold the health of Illinois citizens above all else.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

IDNR's administrative rules allow permit applicants to withhold information used in the fracking process based on "competitive value." However, this term is undefined in the rules and makes no exception for the public's right to know for reasons related to the public's and environmental health and potential occupational exposure. Competitive value should not become a catchall phrase that weighs profit more heavily than public health. The rules should clearly define competitive value. This term should in no way override the provision in the Illinois Constitution that guarantees its citizens a healthy and safe environment. All decisions must hold the health of Illinois citizens above all else.

Sincerely, Sara Buck Chicago, IL 60640

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

My family lives within a mile to a mile and a half of proposed fracking fields. Unless and until there is full transparency and disclosure to the public, fracking should not be permitted.

Sincerely, Charlene Brown 3883 Mt Pleasant Rd Brookport, IL 62910

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

My family lives within a mile to a mile and a half of proposed fracking fields. Unless and until there is full transparency and disclosure to the public, fracking should not be permitted.

Sincerely, Charlene Brown 3883 Mt Pleasant Rd Brookport, IL 62910

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

My family lives within a mile to a mile and a half of proposed fracking fields. Unless and until there is full transparency and disclosure to the public, fracking should not be permitted.

Sincerely, Charlene Brown 3883 Mt Pleasant Rd Brookport, IL 62910

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

My family lives within a mile to a mile and a half of proposed fracking fields. Unless and until there is full transparency and disclosure to the public, fracking should not be permitted.

Sincerely, Charlene Brown 3883 Mt Pleasant Rd Brookport, IL 62910

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

OKAY SO IDNR IS PROTECTING CORPORATIONS MORE THAN CITIZENS JUST BE HONEST ABOUT IT IF THIS IS THE CASE: Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Harry Li 2656 Boddington Lane Naperville, IL 60564

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret. Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of “trade secret” if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: * “Competitive value” is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. * There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of “competitive value” other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: * Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic “competitive value” open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. * Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria “competitive value”. The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. * Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on “competitive value” automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: * “Competitive value” must be fully defined within the rulemaking. * Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. * Any conflict between “competitive value” and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Relevant parts of the Proposed Administrative Rules: 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret. Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of “trade secret” if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: * “Competitive value” is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. * There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of “competitive value” other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: * Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic “competitive value” open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. * Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria “competitive value”. The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. * Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on “competitive value” automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: * “Competitive value” must be fully defined within the rulemaking. * Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. * Any conflict between “competitive value” and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Treesong 2030 S Illinois Ave #9 Carbondale, IL 62903

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.1100 states that the Department may revoke for a wide variety of infractions: "The Department may, through the enforcement process set forth in this Subpart, suspend or revoke a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, order actions to remediate, or issue administrative penalties for one or more of the following causes…" The rules are too lax when the violation involves failing to follow guidelines when building/developing a well or testing its integrity. In those circumstances, the rules should require mandatory revocation of the permit. Rationale: Provisions in Section 1-70 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (Well preparation, construction, and drilling) require adherence to the American Petroleum Institute (API) standards when developing and testing oil and gas wells. A strong case can be made that these are the most important sections in the law because their objective is to reduce the risks of well blowouts, fires and explosions along with the attendant risks of injury or death to workers, adverse public health outcomes to nearby residents, and the pollution of groundwater, air, and soil. There are reasons why failure to adhere to section I-70 must result in permit revocation: - If well operators shortcut the well development standards in Sec. 1-70 or if the well fails any of the required tests in Sec. 1-70, the adverse events cited above become much more likely. Pollution of aquifers is also much more likely and this pollution can be easily overlooked. - Other states have experienced major problems with some rogue companies that systematically and persistently engage in high-risk, cost-cutting violations of regulations, such as these. If some companies are allowed to violate Section 1-70, others will follow their lead. - It was the violation of the provisions in Sec. 1-70 that lead to the Deepwater Horizon explosion in the Gulf of Mexico on 20 April 2010. That explosion claimed 11 lives and led to the largest environmental disaster in American History. Automatic permit revocation for violations of Sec. 1-70 could prove to be one of the more effective ways to ensure higher levels of safety and environmental protection in areas where fracking will occur. If the IDNR is not serious about strict enforcement of Sections 245-520/580, then it has already nullified one of the most important set of regulatory standards for the oil and gas industry.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.1100 states that the Department may revoke for a wide variety of infractions: "The Department may, through the enforcement process set forth in this Subpart, suspend or revoke a high volume horizontal hydraulic fracturing permit, order actions to remediate, or issue administrative penalties for one or more of the following causes…" The rules are too lax when the violation involves failing to follow guidelines when building/developing a well or testing its integrity. In those circumstances, the rules should require mandatory revocation of the permit. Rationale: Provisions in Section 1-70 of the Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act (Well preparation, construction, and drilling) require adherence to the American Petroleum Institute (API) standards when developing and testing oil and gas wells. A strong case can be made that these are the most important sections in the law because their objective is to reduce the risks of well blowouts, fires and explosions along with the attendant risks of injury or death to workers, adverse public health outcomes to nearby residents, and the pollution of groundwater, air, and soil. There are reasons why failure to adhere to section I-70 must result in permit revocation: - If well operators shortcut the well development standards in Sec. 1-70 or if the well fails any of the required tests in Sec. 1-70, the adverse events cited above become much more likely. Pollution of aquifers is also much more likely and this pollution can be easily overlooked. - Other states have experienced major problems with some rogue companies that systematically and persistently engage in high-risk, cost-cutting violations of regulations, such as these. If some companies are allowed to violate Section 1-70, others will follow their lead. - It was the violation of the provisions in Sec. 1-70 that lead to the Deepwater Horizon explosion in the Gulf of Mexico on 20 April 2010. That explosion claimed 11 lives and led to the largest environmental disaster in American History. Automatic permit revocation for violations of Sec. 1-70 could prove to be one of the more effective ways to ensure higher levels of safety and environmental protection in areas where fracking will occur. If the IDNR is not serious about strict enforcement of Sections 245-520/580, then it has already nullified one of the most important set of regulatory standards for the oil and gas industry.

Sincerely, Rui Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of “trade secret” if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. This offers carte blanche to "applicants" to conceal information about their activities at their own discretion while they are doing -- whatever it is they choose to do -- to the ground my family lives on and the water that we drink. It is unacceptable, and I am astonished, though perhaps I should not be these days, that it is proposed. If I were at dinner, and a stranger burst in and shook a vial of "something" (trade secret!) all over my food and threw it in my face, I would not regard it as irrelevant, or presumptuous of me to ask, what was in that vial. One does not perform one's regulatory responsibility by simply relegating anything meaningful that might be regulated outside one's mandate.

Sincerely, Katherine Kasserman Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Abraham Secular Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Alicia Klepfer Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Alonzo Cummins Chicago, IL 60612

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Revisions Needed: -"Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. -Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. -Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. Human health is more important that cometitive value. Please protect the residents of Illinois. Please consider human health in all policies.

Sincerely, Amanda Woodall 4949 N. Whipple Street Chicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, andrew hwang Chicago, IL 60615

Fair Economy Illinois

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: 1. "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. 2. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: 1. Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. 2. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. 3. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: 1. "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. 2. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. 3. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Andrew Hwang Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Andrew Sigman Chicago, IL 60651

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Anica Washington Chicago, IL 60619

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Anna Woolery Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Anne Pertner Pertner Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Ashish Kathuria Vernon Hills, IL 60601

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Ava Benezra Chicago, IL 60615

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Beth Rempe Champaign, IL 61820

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Bing Li Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Brian Menzel Chicago, IL 60608

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Britni Austin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Bruce Anderson Rolling Meadows, IL 60008

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Camil Machaj Lemont, IL 60439

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Carla Hunter Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Carolyn Treadway Normal, IL 61761

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Christian Mortensen Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Christina Scianna Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Cindy Chung Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Clara Kao Chicago, IL 60637

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Curtis Morris Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Dakota Dompke Belleville, IL 62221

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Daniel Ramus CHicago, IL 60625

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, David Klawitter Chicago, IL 60607

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, David Zask NY, IL 10128

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment.

Sincerely, Dominic Giafagleone Carbondale, IL 62901

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60605

In reference to Subpart G: Chemical Disclosure; Trade Secrets

Section 245.720 Department Publication of Chemical Disclosures and Claims of Trade Secret

Section 245.720(d) of the Proposed Hydraulic Fracturing Regulatory Act administrative rules, states: IDNR allows permit applicants to withhold chemical disclosure information under a claim of "trade secret" if they can establish that (1) the information has not been published, disseminated, or otherwise become a matter of general public knowledge, and (2) the information has competitive value. Problems with this section: "Competitive value" is not defined in the various administrative code definitions. There is no IDNR administrative criteria provided which is the basis of "competitive value" other than, apparently, a self-identified one provided by the fracking operator. Why these are problems: Undefined and catch-all allowances for generic "competitive value" open the door for any and all dangerous chemicals to be undisclosed simply based on the operators desire to do so. Individual ingredients in the various chemical products used during hydraulic fracturing cannot be considered trade secrets under the criteria "competitive value". The regulations should be revised to state that information on file with IDNR must be disclosed to the public. Raising such an allowance for a fracking operator to not disclose potentially dangerous chemicals based on "competitive value" automatically gives them more power than the basic claim of the law which is to protect the environment of Illinois. Revisions Needed: "Competitive value" must be fully defined within the rulemaking. Competitive value must not in any way supersede a determination of the public right to know and the basic legislative and Illinois Constitutional provision of a healthy and safe environment for its citizens. Any conflict between "competitive value" and the public right to know must be decided on the inherent protection of the citizens and the environment. The US EPA EPCRA regulations at 40 CFR 350 subpart A provide valuable guidance for fleshing out the language of the Act, in ways that are entirely consistent with it. We recommend in particular that the Department review the detailed showing required in 40 CFR 350.7, and import those requirements here as appropriate.

Sincerely, Dylan Amlin Chicago, IL 60640